

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1906.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE CONGREGATION.\*

BY GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.

Theory and practice do not always agree. When Luther in 1523 published his treatise on the right of the congregation to decide questions of doctrine and to appoint its own ministers, he stated a principle which our Church cordially accepted. In theory we recognize the congregation as the subject, the primary agent in Church work. But in practice it is not so. The congregation is not the subject but the object, not the force but the field.

Sometimes the Church is an autocracy. The minister is "it." People speak of Pastor So-and-so's Church. When the minister is sick, is on his vacation, or has gone to synod, there is "no church." Again the Church is an aristocracy. Its affairs are managed by the council or the Board of Trustees, and to all intents and purposes they are the Church. Synods, originally supposed to represent Churches, have to a great extent become merely associations of ministers and ex-ministers, with a sprinkling of laymen, who too often are present only in a perfunctory capacity. The delegate is introduced not as the delegate of such and such a Church, but as Pastor So-and-so's delegate. Seldom do congregations take the initiative in ecclesiastical procedure, and seldom is synodical action referred to the congregation for ratification.

\* A discourse delivered before the Synod of New York and New Jersey, Albany, N. Y., September 26th, 1905.

When these delegates serve in the Common Council, or are sent to the Legislature, they have much to say, because they represent an actual constituency and tangible interests. But when they come to Synod they have nothing special to say, because the Churches that sent them have no well defined interest in the meeting. The delegates represent themselves only and their participation is only such as is called forth by their personal interest in the proceedings.

Hence the Synod is seldom troubled with questions outside of the usual routine. The contributions might just as well be sent directly to the treasurers of the Boards, and there are no details of Home or Foreign Missions, Church Extension or other causes that could not just as well be settled by correspondence with the secretaries. Anyone who has attended several meetings of the synod could write the minutes in advance and all the expense of an actual meeting might be saved or devoted to other objects. It is of course a pleasure to meet the brethren and to exchange fraternal greetings, but the real business of Synod could be transacted just as effectively and more economically in other ways. There is not even an opportunity to discuss questions of doctrine or Church economy, for the dismal routine of business crowds it out, and the few attempts that have been made in this direction have failed of their object.

Why is it that synods are not in reality representative gatherings? It is because the churches have not cultivated a congregational life and have no interests that require representation. The congregation is in too many cases simply an audience which stately assembles to hear Dr. Blank preach. It is a question of how many people are in the pews. It is not a question of what the congregation is doing, but it is a question of what the minister is doing, how many hundred families he visits, how many sermons he preaches and how many people come to hear him preach. If Dr. Blank is an attractive preacher, the church is filled. If not, not. It is not a question whether the congregation is attractive, whether the people have converted many sinners or brought back lapsed sheep into

the fold, whether the people are magnetic with Christian power and hold men in the Church regardless of who happens to be in the pulpit. It is all a question of the minister. If the work prospers, the minister gets the credit. If it does not prosper, it is the minister's fault. And when finally Dr. Blank dies, or is called to another pulpit, the country is scoured to find some competent preacher who for a consideration, graded according to his pew filling capacity, will undertake to do the work of an incompetent congregation. In other words, the congregation has no other function than to attend church, pay its pew rents, listen to a Sunday sermon and raise the apportionment. No wonder churches do not grow, for however well they may be fed, they are seldom called upon to use their strength.

But along with the subsidence of the congregation as the primary factor in the work of the Church, and perhaps because of it, our age has witnessed a multiplication of other agencies to do the work of the congregation. There is the Women's Society and occasionally the Men's Club, the Luther League, the Christian Endeavor Society, the W. H. and F. M. Society, the W. C. T. U., the Junior League, the King's Daughters and the Junior Endeavorers, until for the multitude of trees it is hard to get a view of the woods. Thus in the congregation itself the substitutes, the parasites, absorb the life of the tree, and the parent plant necessarily decays. Consequently the community no longer looks to the congregation for its inspiration and life. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Carnegie Library, the Social Settlement and the Salvation Army are the forces to which Society looks for the elevation, strength and saving power which the Church is commissioned to give. And even in the distinctively religious work of the Church the impotence of the congregation is conceded in the increasing prominence given to special meetings and to the services of an itinerant evangelist.

It is a legitimate question whether in the emphasis we place on the ministry, societies, theological seminaries, Christian literature and all the various agencies for the promotion of Christianity, we are not overlooking the primary agent in the Divine

economy, the congregation. Has it a position which should be recognized? Has it functions which cannot be delegated? With all our alleged Protestantism, are we not in danger of atrophying the most important force, the Church itself. In our efforts to regenerate society and to realize the Kingdom, may it not be well to remember the true nature and functions of the congregation?

I wish to make

A PLEA FOR A FULLER RECOGNITION OF THE CONGREGATION.

1. In view of what it is, and
2. In view of its functions.

1. In view of what it is, that is, in view of its original place in the institution of Christ and in the practice of the Apostolical Church.

Our subject lies in the domain of Practical Theology. It is an effort to understand the problem of the Church, and hence has an important relation to our synodical life. I know of no question which at the present time more urgently invites our attention. We have no pressing doctrinal problems. The question of predestination which agitates our Western synods does not perceptibly disturb our churches in the East. The conflict over the Common Service and the Ministerial Acts is a thing of the past. We are not greatly vexed even over such matters as vestments and paraments. But the question of the Church has a perennial interest. We assemble to report the labors of the year, lamenting how little has been accomplished. We listen to the story of each other's trials and difficulties, and we pray for Divine light and strength for the work of another year. The burden of our hopes and prayers is, What can be done to improve the condition of our congregations and to make them more effective in advancing the Kingdom of God.

The Kingdom of God is found through the Church. There is in this world no other gate into the Kingdom than through the Church. In a broad sense the doctrine *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is true. Christian life grows only in the life of the Church. There is, it is true, a personal life which belongs to the realm



of ethics, but there cannot be a distinctively Christian life which is not expressed in the life of the Church. It is in the life of the Church that Christianity manifests itself among men. This life includes all the forces and methods through which the Christian religion is acquired, grows, is taught and spread abroad. And in this development of the Christian religion, the primary factor is not the individual Christian, not the minister nor the theological seminary, not the religious press nor the evangelist, not the numerous associations for Christian work, but it is the Christian congregation.

In 1. Peter 2 the congregation of believers is called a "holy priesthood." Jesus spoke of the congregation when he said he would build his Church "upon this rock." In the 18th of Matthew He gives to His Church, that is to the congregation of believers, the power of binding and loosing. In the second of Acts the believers are described as continuing "steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." In the 14th of First Corinthians are enumerated the spiritual gifts which belong to the congregation. The Church is the body of the Lord. In her the Lord is truly present with his gifts and his Spirit. The Word and the sacraments are effective, not *ex opere operato* but *ex opere operantis* through the power of the Divine Master working in and through the Church. The New Testament conception of the Church is that of a society of regenerated individuals, building itself up upon the truth, and appointed to spiritual service. It seems clear that in the normal and typical life of the Church as illustrated in the apostolic period, the congregation is the primary factor in Christian effort and in the extension of the Kingdom of God.

But this ideal conception did not last. The Cyprianic theory came in and a legalistic Church put the clergy in a place by themselves superior to the laity. According to this theory the Church is an institution rather than a communion, and its direction and control come from without rather than from within. This theory is not without justification in the nature of things and in the teaching of Scripture. Over against the Montanistic

and Donatistic views which threatened the Church, there was reason for it. But the exclusive manner in which it controlled the Church for thirteen centuries suppressed the other and more vital principle of the early Church and called for a reformation.

The Lutheran Reformation stated a new principle, or rather stated anew the old principle which was formulated by the Apostle Peter in the words "Ye are a royal priesthood." This principle repudiates not only episcopal claims but every clerical assumption of authority independent of the congregation. In a movement which Thomasius describes as a central epoch in the world's history, the Reformation negated a theory of the Church which had practically eliminated the congregation. Neither hierarchy nor hierarchy finds a place in the doctrinal system of Lutheranism.

But theory and practice do not always agree. While the German Reformation clearly maintained the position that the Church was, in the main, the communion of saints, for some reason the succeeding century failed to reap the practical benefits of this doctrine. A State Church had been established in which princes were installed in the places formerly held by the Catholic bishops. Perhaps this was one reason. Also there were intense doctrinal controversies which gave dominance to the teaching office. This may have been another reason.

This much is certain, a new hierarchy was established in place of the old one, and it seemed as if Christ had again surrendered His Church into the hands of the priests and rulers.

The Pietistic movement made an effective protest against the new sacerdotalism and restored the priesthood to the congregation where it originally belonged. A phase of this movement developed later in England under Wesley. Both Methodism and Puritanism are in the main on the side of congregational life.

Passing by the period of Rationalism, during which Herder, who was preacher as well as poet, made an important contribution to the subject, we note that Schleiermacher gave the definitions which have placed the problem of the Church in the foremost position in the thought of modern times. I can only

refer to this crisis and indicate its importance, without dwelling upon the scope or the details of the movement.

There are two deductions from this doctrine of the Church as a communion. First, the importance of the individual. Each member has gifts which it is his privilege and his duty to use for the benefit of the society. In the First Epistle to the Corinthians seven of the spiritual gifts which belonged to that congregation are named. They may have had more. Our congregations may have these gifts and other gifts, and more gifts. Certain it is that every Church has charisms which it is our duty to discover and employ. To begin with, we must dispel from our minds the Romish idea that only the acts connected with the sanctuary or the Sabbath are religious acts. When we remember that everything that a Christian does, eating or drinking and whatsoever he does, should be done to the glory of God, what a wide and pervasive ministry our churches should have. The lawyer and the laborer, the physician and the washerwoman in their daily round of duties acting in the name of the Master perform a ministry no less sacred than that of the minister in the pulpit.

The presence of one Christian family in an apartment house, or one Christian workman in the factory, or one Christian member in a club or lodge, will have a transforming influence, if the Savior's statement concerning salt and light has any meaning. From an ethical point of view it is perilous to have a good impulse unless it can be translated into a good deed. So in religion, unless people apply the truth they have learned, it will do them little good. Doubtless we have many men in our Churches who can do something. But because they cannot take part in the prayer meeting or testify in words, they feel that they are shut out from religious work. They have gifts, but the Church does not appreciate them, and so they go to the lodge or to the club where their talents are appreciated and employed. The minister frequently complains that he has so much work to do. Why not pile some of this work on other shoulders. A dozen pair of shoulders can easily carry a burden which would be too heavy for one. Undreamed of

capacities and powers are hidden among the members of our Churches which might all be used for the edification of the Church. Not only would they themselves be benefited, but it would conduce largely to the wealth and power of the society if the personality of the individual members were thus turned into the common work. The possession of these gifts involves the obligation to use them and points out an important mission of the Church. Baxter two hundred years ago, in his classic work on the Reformed Pastor, showed that the ideal congregation was where every member had something to do. In my own church, I make it a rule never to do anything myself that somebody else can do.

The compilers of statistics are continually counting people. If their object is to ascertain the strength of the churches, they should weigh the members rather than count them. When we return to the Lutheran conception of the congregation, our people will not simply be numbered but they will be valued according to their personal contribution to the society. Not what they give, but the extent to which they give themselves will be the measure of their value in the Church.

The second deduction from this doctrine of the Church as a communion, is the obligation of the society to care for all its members. The word must be brought effectively to all its members. On this point Romanists, early Lutherans and Pietists had each their own theories and methods. The actual condition of our Churches compels us to ask to what extent our congregations are meeting this obligation. A limited number of people come to church. But think of the vast numbers who have lapsed. Amid the cares and sorrows of life, under the weight of misfortune and of sin, what a multitude there is about us as sheep without a shepherd. And yet not all of these people are heathen. In some way or other they are related to the Church, and I hope that during the coming year our pastors will include many of them in the third of the new statistical columns which the late General Synod has provided for us, entitled Baptized Members.

The modern solution of this problem is to work through

societies. I may seem to have spoken in a disparaging way of societies. But such was not my intention. The Church itself is a society and hence cannot be hostile to her children. The idea of the congregation involves such an organization as that all may be reached. The organization of societies combining certain forces for reaching certain conditions is legitimate.

There are societies outside of the Church. One of the greatest movements of modern times, the "Inner Mission," of Germany, is a network of societies which began outside of the Church. Indeed it came into existence because the Church had neglected to provide for the conditions which were met by the "Inner Mission." But it worked in the spirit of the Church and in its development associated itself more and more with the Church, so that it may now be looked upon as identified with the Church. But societies cannot take the place of the Church and are an obstruction when they assume to do so. The Church has the Word and the Sacraments. The Church has fellowship and prayers. The Church has the power of the keys. The Church comes with the divine mandate and the divine promise. The Church is a plenipotentiary with authority to declare war or to make peace.

When we remember how in our own field the Church has neglected her opportunity and how inadequate are her resources for the work that should be done, it seems ungracious for a moment to question the value of the Social Settlement, with the splendid heroism of the men and the women who are giving their lives to that work. But no matter how many amenities it may carry to the slums, being silent on the subject of religion, it is unable to carry the heaviest burdens and to wash away the deepest stains.

The Church is the Social Settlement which the Master ordained. His ideals of social improvement must be the norm for us. It is sometimes claimed that there is a tendency among Protestant denominations to form congregations along the line of social distinctions. Among Roman Catholics this is impossible, and Protestants are half ashamed to admit that it is the case with them. But in point of fact, from many churches the

poor are debarred. Either it is the rented pew, or the fine clothes or an indefinable something in the very atmosphere which says to the man with the gold ring, wearing gay clothing and goodly apparel, "Sit thou here in a good place," and to the poor man in vile raiment "Stand thou there or sit here under my footstool."

There are some social advantages that may be gained from such assemblies for hebdomadal edification or titillation. But these could easily be secured elsewhere. On the other hand a Church loses inestimable privileges by not adhering to its original mission. It is only when a congregation enters into the daily life of the community, sharing its needs, helping to solve its problems, and by its own divine inspiration quickening the life of the world, that it reaches its ideal, that it conforms to the Master's requirement: "Ye are the salt of the earth, ye are the light of the world."

There are societies inside of the Church. A Church can only gain if with careful discrimination it organizes its membership in such a way as to attain the objects of a congregational life. This is a theme which requires separate treatment and I have time only to remark that such societies should be "of the Church, by the Church and for the Church." Hence they should simply be branches of the congregation, reporting to the congregation, responsible to the congregation and engaged in carrying out the details of such work as the congregation in its entirety is unable to perform.

2. I plead for a fuller recognition of the congregation in view of its functions.

The functions of a congregation are manifold. But for our present purpose we may confine ourselves to the general classification: preaching, catechisation, church extension, worship, discipline and government. Some of these seem to belong to a special office, but in point of fact they are all functions of the congregation.

Preaching. A man must be a Christian before he can be a preacher. And when he preaches he is not only delivering a message to the congregation as the messenger of God, but in

another relation he is also the representative of the congregation, speaking out of the Christian consciousness of the congregation, and out of the fulness of the truth committed to the Church. His work is sacrificial as well as sacramental.

A fuller congregational life would enlarge the field for the exercise of the preaching function of the Church. The school-house at the cross roads, and the hired hall in the slums would be places where the intelligent and devoted young men of our Church could go in the afternoon and evening and repeat to Zaccheus and to Magdalen the message which the minister gave to his people in the morning. Perhaps you will regard this as radical doctrine and are disposed to quote "*nisi rite vocatus.*" Brother, if the Augsburg Confession had been written in our day, I feel sure it would have declared that such an opening constituted a legitimate call, and that the Church was exercising its proper functions in sending forth Christian men to respond to it.

Closely connected with the preaching office is that of the lay reader. The early Church made much of this office. In Europe almost every Lutheran congregation has one in the person of the schoolmaster. In this country, in this clergy-ridden Church of ours such a thing is seldom heard of. But why should we not revive an office which has the endorsement of ancient ecclesiastical usage? Why should we close our churches when we go to synod, or are sick abed, or are unexpectedly called away? Why should not some member of the Church, specially trained for this work, read the Common Service, give out the hymns, and read an edifying discourse to the congregation? Episcopalians have their lay readers, Methodists their local preachers; Lutherans, with clearer and broader views on the subject of the universal priesthood, ought to take the lead in finding work of this kind for their intelligent and devoted laymen.

A fuller congregational life would find a large field for this subordinate office of the preaching function.

Catechisation. This is a work not necessarily connected with the preaching office, although the minister is properly charged



with the duty of seeing to it that it is done. Indeed the very first and best catechisation is that which is given in the home by the Christian father and mother.

No more important problem presents itself to us at this time than that of the religious instruction of children, no more important duty devolves upon the Church, in a country where secular education is, to say the least, non religious, than the catechisation of the young. And this is a function of the congregation. But when the congregation does not exercise this function, for the reason that it has only a theoretical existence, the duty seems to devolve upon the minister. And when the minister has so many other thing to do, because, besides all the visits he has to make, he absorbs into his own sacred person so many of the functions of the congregation, he declare that he cannot find time for the work, and passes it on to the Sunday School.

A fuller congregational life would recognize the importance of this function and would find a method of exercising it in a manner at least approximately adequate. I would only refer to the possibility of securing lay helpers in the work of aiding the pastor in week-day instruction, and also of so organizing the Sunday School that in place of being in a relation independent of the Church it would contribute more definitely and more effectively to the life of the Church itself.

Church Extension. The Church must actualize herself in the world, extend her borders and seek to gain others into her communion. In Home Missions and in Foreign Missions she fulfils what is not only a duty and a privilege, but a very condition of her existence. But in these fields also the hierarchical conception has crowded out the congregational view, and we are generally content with vicarious service, with sending out our agents working under a special commission.

A feeling of congregational responsibility will provide us with a larger force of workers, and that is what we need. Twenty years ago, in 1884, our synod \* numbered 9,072 communi-

\*The Synod of New York and New Jersey.



cants; five years later, 10,302; in 1894, 9,329; in 1899, 9,393; in 1904, 11,688. Figures are sometimes unreliable, especially Lutheran figures. But whatever errors may have crept into these statistics, surely twenty years is time enough to correct them, and to eliminate them from the general average. We may therefore assume that they are approximately correct. They show an apparent increase in twenty years of 2,616. But this is more than accounted for by the congregations that have been added to our number. In reality the churches of twenty years ago have declined rather than gone forward. But even if the apparent increase were an actual one, what would it show? It would show that our churches have added 29 per cent. to their membership during twenty years, a rate of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum.

The average growth of population is  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum, or 50 per cent. in twenty years, and hence we have relatively gone backward instead of forward. But the following presentation will better illustrate the point I am trying to make. These figures show that it takes 66 members a whole year to bring one new member into the Church. It would not be a record to be proud of if we ministers were charged with this duty and credited with its performance, but when we remember that that is a congregational duty, the presentation becomes impressive. The normal growth of the Church by baptism and confirmation ought to account for this solitary addition, and the question naturally arises, what have these 66 members been doing in every one of the last twenty years for the extension of the Church? Let us put this question to ourselves until we realize our personal responsibility in the matter of extending and promoting the growth of the Church.

It is all right for us to endeavor to increase the ranks of the ministry, and we may well deplore the lack of candidates. *But there is a greater need than of ministers, we need congregations.* We need to remember that in the normal life of the Church, the congregation is the primary factor in the work of church extension. Every substitution of other agents only leads to

atrophy and the displacement of the original and legitimate force.

On this point a writer in the "Outlook" recently said :

"The Christian Church is more than a spiritual fellowship, than a worshiping community, than a school of disciples. It is organized to disseminate throughout the world the principles and the spirit of Jesus Christ. Club it may be—social, spiritual, worshiping, educational—but it is also a club organized for a definite propaganda ; as much so as the Cobden Club, the Republican Club, the City Club. If it forgets this object of its organization, allows it to fall into abeyance or even into the background, it presently ceases to be a school of Christ, and the teaching of its ministry becomes theological, or ethical, or literary ; it ceases to be a worshiping community, and aestheticism takes the place of penitence and prayer and praise ; it ceases to be a spiritual fellowship and becomes a class church."

A fuller congregational life would make our churches at least as active in securing converts as are political parties or clubs in advancing their ideas.

Worship. This is peculiarly a congregational function. The very title of the book we use, the Common Service, that is the service of the people, indicates its congregational character.

With historic tact our Church collected and transmitted the liturgical treasures of the Christian centuries. In her doctrine she carefully discriminated between the sacrificial and sacramental elements of worship. With freedom and truth as the key-notes of our system, we were enabled to retain a historical structure, without becoming subject to a mechanical ritualism.

In our day the Service which our Fathers rescued from the past has been restored to the churches, and it has been made possible for the smallest country congregation to unite with the universal Lutheran Church in a Common Service.

This historical service is a treasure of great value and beauty. It will be worth while to use it and not to be content with simply having it in our books or making an occasional and fragmentary use of its parts.

To those who seek a better knowledge of the meaning of the

parts, and their relation to the whole, there will be abundant compensation. Its symbolism, its relations, and finally its bearing upon the Christian life are subjects worthy of study. But its chief value is that it is a Common Service, a service of the people.

A fuller congregational life will remove the liturgy from the position of an *opus operatum*, from the sphere of an unmeaning ritual, will eliminate quartet choirs and hireling singers, and will restore the Service to its proper place as a legitimate function of the congregation, an expression of its religious life, and a symbol of its Christianity.

An intelligent and persistent effort to instruct and train our people, especially our young people, in the meaning and use of the liturgy would bring immediate and valuable results, would lead them to say with the Psalmist:

"One thing have I asked of Jehovah, that will I seek after: That I may dwell in the house of Jehovah all the days of my life, To behold the beauty of Jehovah." Or as Luther translated it:

"Zu schauen die schoenen Gottesdienste des Herrn."

Discipline. Alas what has become of it! It is an extinct function, for the reason that the only body authorized to enforce it has, except in theory, ceased to exist.

For, any discipline exercised by a minister or a Church Council on their own account is illegitimate, being an assumption of authority not committed to them by the Head of the Church. As matters now stand, there is not a lodge nor a military company, nor a political club where they do not have better discipline than we have in the Church. And yet it is a function that is essential to the well being of the Church's life. A fuller congregational life would restore discipline to its proper place.

And finally government. How can there be a strong and safe government of any form, when the very foundations of all good government, the consent of the governed, have not been laid? A few weeks ago, when the mighty autocracy of Russia seemed to be tottering to destruction, it was suggested that the only way to restore a safe government would be

through a recognition of the almost embryonic town meeting, which had from time immemorial existed throughout a great part of the empire.

I do not know of any denomination where there is less government, strong and safe government, and more of the spirit of "do as you please," than in our Lutheran churches. (Always excepting the Missourians, among whom the congregational system has been consistently and well developed.) If we have a strong minister, he does as he pleases with his congregation. If we have a strong congregation they do as they please with their minister. If there is a controversy, one or the other has to suffer. If they seem to be equally strong there is a tug of war, until it can be proved which is the stronger. But in any case the decision is not reached until much harm has been done to the Church and to the interests of the Kingdom of God. The history of our own synod is punctuated with the wrecked careers of ministers and of churches because of our inadequate government. Then some one says we ought to have a bishop. Another would have the president of synod invested with greater authority. Still another is willing to wait till synod meets, expecting that its decision will solve the problem. But, brethren, in our system no government, episcopal, synodical, or pastoral, can have any prospect of success until it is based upon the resuscitation and regeneration of the congregation.

The functions of the congregation are manifold and yet they are but one. As Nitzsch says in his monumental work on Pastoral Theology, in all their different modes they presuppose faith active in love, they have the same general object, edification in Christ. They are summed up in the words of St. Peter: "That ye may show forth the excellencies of Him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

In treating this great subject within the compass of a brief discourse, I realize that I have presented only the vague outline of that which my theme demands. I must leave it to you to fill out the picture as your time and thoughts will permit. Nor have I felt at liberty to enter into details and to suggest

plans and methods. My object was to discuss principles rather than methods. I recall the caution given by St. Basil, "We need less technology, and more theology." Nor has it been in a spirit of cynical criticism that I have considered this question. I am included among those who have slipped away from the evangelical standards, and I earnestly desire to find my way back again. Furthermore, in the office to which you have called me, I have had opportunity for observing the standpoint which is taken by both pastor and people. It may be summed up in this one sentence: "The congregation is the field and not the force."

With these conditions in view, I have endeavored to elucidate the fundamental principles involved in the question and to emphasize their importance.

I know how easy it is to adopt the ministerial conception of the office, if I may so term the hierarchical standpoint. All history shows that the churches are forever slipping back to it. The ministers consent because thereby their office is exalted. The people have no objections because thereby they are relieved of a great deal of responsibility.

I know also how difficult is the work of reform. You have often urged some of these considerations upon your people, but you cannot get them to respond. They leave everything to the preacher, and he in his delusion shoulders their duties and thinks he is doing God service. I plead for a reformation. I do not ask for a simple change in some of our methods, but I hold that an entirely new attitude is required. This is what I have tried to emphasize and repeat in every key: the congregation and not the minister is the primary factor in the care of souls. If I read history aright, the call for evangelical reform has always been closely related to this question, and whenever the congregation has lapsed from the position assigned to it by the Master and by the usage of the New Testament a new reformation is necessary.

A reformation of our congregational life is needed, it we would attain the high ideals which are held before us in the doctrine and practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE RESPONSIBILITY AND DUTY OF A THEOLOGICAL PROFESSOR.\*

BY REV. S. E. GREENAWALT, A.M.

It has seemed wise to the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College, for the better equipment of the Theological Seminary, to establish an additional professorship in the institution. This has been made possible by a generous bequest to increase the efficiency of this especial department. The title of the new chair thus established, designating its particular department of Theological study, is *The Chair of New Testament Philology and Criticism*.

You, my brother, have been honored by a unanimous election to this position in this school of the prophets. It is my personal privilege and official duty on behalf of the Board of Directors, whose representative I am, to address you briefly at this time. You are about to be formally inducted into a position of exceeding importance and great responsibility. I need not remind you of the high honor of having your name associated in your life work with those of men, living and dead, who have largely impressed their personality and their teaching upon this institution. The life of the sainted Doctor Keller whose dust lies in beautiful Fern Cliff hard by, and whose spirit was released to early reward, should be an inspiration to every successor in the privilege of teaching the coming ministry. The saintly life and the valued teachings of the sweet spirited Doctor Sprecher, who by the side of the placid Pacific, in the gloaming of a golden day awaits his coronation, should inspire to a diligent study of the Book, and the ensouling of its teaching into a holy life. The names of other noble men need not be mentioned who wrought well in their way and

\* A charge delivered by the Rev. S. E. Greenawalt, as President of the Board of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, at the Installation of Rev. V. G. A. Tressler, Ph.D., D.D., in the Chair of New Testament Philology and Criticism in Wittenberg Theological Seminary, Nov. 8th, 1905.

time and whose memory and influence linger as a benediction. In your co-laborers and fellow teachers the Church has manifested her fullest confidence in calling each of them in turn, to the highest official position within her gift. I congratulate you upon being the recipient of such confidence and high honor. You have come to a place of vantage and opportunity, which to the conscientious soul means likewise solemn responsibility.

In the constitution of Wittenberg College it is announced that "a chief aim of the institution shall be the education of young men for the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church." This is *the* mission of the Theological Seminary.

To train ministers of the Word for our Church and time, and send them forth with a clear and unequivocal message, able to present the same in a manner that will command the attention and confidence of men, and move to active acceptance of the same, is the high purpose of the divinity school. The minister must ever be an *evangel* to the lost, a herald to the wayward and indifferent, and a proclaimer of the truth to a world lying in error. Emphasis must above all rest upon the especial work of fitting *men to preach the gospel of Christ*. This ideal must needs be constantly held before the student in the theological seminary as a necessary goal in his life work, that he attain the ability to preach, interpret, illustrate and present truth in such a way that it will be grasped by the common mind and coveted as a personal possession. If he fail in this he has failed in an essential in his high calling.

A note of warning has been sounded in a recent article, relative to much of the Theological teaching of to-day, by one who is himself an honored teacher in one of the conservative schools in another denomination. Professor Theo. W. Hunt, D.D., of Princeton Seminary, writes: "Teaching becomes more and more a science, a vocation in itself, with its own methods and ideals, a profession in the specific sense, and inclining as such to technical processes and results.

"The member of the seminary faculty finds himself by force of his environment approaching all problems that come to him from the abstract and theoretical side. The relation of Biblical to philosophical studies is so pronounced and vital

in modern thinking that the method of theological investigation has become metaphysical and psychologic, until at length the didactic process prevails and theology is presented as nothing more or less than one of the philosophies. The 'Gospels' and 'Epistles' are now examined too much as Kant's 'Critique,' and the 'Dialogues' of Plato would be, so that much direct, practical purpose is lost to the dominance of the merely educational and speculative." He adds: "Most of the strength of these centers of sacred learning is expended in the line of theological discussion and controversy; in the application of the speculative method of the university class-room to the interpretation of Scripture; indeed to a theological training as a professional pursuit, especially attractive as such to the divinity professor, as well as to that increasing class of students who are most intense upon the investigation of a subject for its own sake as a mental discipline rather than for any ultimate purpose as related to the practical work of the ministry." May this criticism never be true of our cherished institution, but rather may the prayer of the first president of this school written down the day following that upon which the College grounds were surveyed continue to find answer: "That this academic grove may be a place to which hundreds will resort to drink of the pure fountains of knowledge, and then go forth into the world to do good, to bless mankind." Or that there be realized still the hope expressed by the second honored head of the institution in his inaugural, that "This institution be not only a seat of learning, but also the abode of deep and lively piety." We are pleased to believe that this word of warning from even so high a source is not needed in all institutions and that *this* seminary has continued to the older and truer ideal.

You, my brother, are a teacher. Your studies are not merely or primarily for scholastic attainments, intellectual pleasure, or to fit for the discussion of obscure and difficult philological or critical questions, but that you may better teach young men to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ to a lost and perishing world.

Exactness in scholarship is desirable, but not to the neglect of ability to impart the truth and cause men to feel and be moved



by its power. The Church is calling for efficient preachers of the Word.

Men teach by what they are and by what they do as well as by what they say. Therefore the ideals that are held before the student for his attainment will be most effectually presented not by words alone but by life and example. Luther has said that "A theologian is not made by much thinking, or reading or reflecting, but by holy living and deep experience." It goes without saying that the world and the Church, God and men, demand of men in this position a high degree of that Christian excellence that they are called upon to teach. There is expected purity of motive, integrity of purpose, application to duty, a knowledge of the Book, a godly walk and conversation, a *passion for souls* and absolute faith in the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation, so that the young men who come in contact with them as teachers will know them as exemplifications of the truth.

You are a teacher of theology. The time is happily past in our seminary when a single professor, as in the early day, is expected to teach all the branches of theological science and be equally proficient in all. With a foundation deep and broad, by this happy division, you are given time to specialize and more truly to become a master in your chosen field. But the seminary in all the departments must ever be one in spirit and aim, namely, to furnish the most efficient training that ministers of the Word may be "workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" and that they be thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The practical work of the ministry must be emphasized.

The young men from the seminary need to know the theological thought of the past, and its result in the life and character of men; but they need to know also the thought of the present and the trend of to-day, and be truly anchored to the verities of the eternal Word, that they be not swept away by a flood tide of current speculation, or dragged down by the undertow of pretended scholastic attainment.

Be not anxious over much to discard the old because it is old, content to realize that some things are fixed and by un-

failing tests have proved their right to remain. Ours is a conservative Church. Nor yet be fearful of the new when presented with full credentials that it is the true, for only truth shall at last survive. The Church of the Reformation has ever encouraged true scholarship and thorough investigation.

Yours is a call and a commission to a denominational institution. The historic name Wittenberg designates it as thoroughly evangelical and conservatively Lutheran. It was because the fathers believed that the great Reformer's conception of truth was the right conception, and was important to the world, that they in great faith and sacrifice planted yet another institution of learning in the fertile soil of the middle West with its primary object, to train men for the ministry of the Word in the Lutheran faith. This faith needs no apologist in any intelligent community. It has proven its worth; its fruit remains. It should be clearly taught, vigorously preached, loyally lived.

As the sainted Doctor Wolf has written: "The doctrines which the Lutheran teaches have stood the test of every conceivable form of opposition. They are substantially the same as when they changed the face of Europe in the sixteenth century. While recognizing that the expressions and adaptations of the Gospel vary with the progress of culture and civilization, the Lutherans have no idea that the truth itself ever changes and they cast no such imputation upon the inspired teachings as are implied in the claim that only after eighteen centuries is the human mind able to reach its correct interpretation."

They know what they believe and whatever remains for them to do in order to attain the highest efficiency in church work, they have not first to settle the principles or limits of their creed. Neither have they any place in this country for the "new theology." A loyalty to this faith that has girdled the globe, that has proven its adaptability to all classes and nationalities, that has ministered to Emperors, Kings, scholars and statesmen as well as the humblest toiler and lowliest servant, a faith that fosters learning and nurtures piety, a faith

that seeks fruit in character, a hearty loyalty to this faith is expected of you by the Church you are called to serve.

You are called to be a teacher of religious teachers. The subject matter of your especial department involves the very foundations of the Christian faith. The fundamental facts of Christianity focalize in a person. The truth concerning the life, teachings and purpose of this person is revealed to us in a book. This book, the New Testament, its authenticity, authorship, integrity and content is the especial theme of your investigation and teaching. With these records and revelations the subject of inquiry and attack, from open enemies and even good men in high councils posing as friends, your position is of vast importance and great responsibility. The need of the Church is an educated, devout and fearless ministry. History has proven that a heroic ministry has never arisen save from those of undoubted faith in the integrity and inspiration of the Book. The mere professional, ethical, or humanitarian teacher ever lacks in the realization of the divine authority and urgency that prompts to self-denial and utter abandon in the service of Jesus Christ. It is yours to so direct the student in the quest for truth that he may not be enamored and satisfied with an unproved theory, however new and attractive, but that his faith be buttressed by evidence cumulative through nineteen centuries; so that confident of a "thus saith the Lord" as his message, his faith will rise to assurance, his halting doubts give place to courageous endeavor, and the energies of his life be fully surrendered to his holy calling.

But I will not trespass upon your time. It is but fitting that we should expectantly await the deliverance of the message by the one called to an important part in the training of the Church's future preachers. I tarry but to assure you of the entire confidence, as we believe, of the members of the Board and the Church represented by them of your fitness both in head and heart for the duties before you. The sincere desire is that you may have large success and great personal joy in your work and the fervent prayer is offered that the Holy Spirit may guide you into all the truth and be your daily helper in imparting the same.

## ARTICLE III.

## NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM IN A LUTHERAN DIVINITY SCHOOL. \*

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, PH.D., D.D.

Fathers, Brethren, and Fellow-Students:

I count it no mean thing to stand this evening in your presence and in the presence of God on this introductory occasion. With you I here unite in the initial functions of a newly assumed relationship, not lightly compacted, not easily disannulled.

Necessarily formal as these legally authorized proceedings must be, there is upon my part, I assure you, likewise a personal sense of the profoundest sort. Who would not be moved in entering upon a field of so large demand and so high import? A field so altogether horizonless.

As a man, I am to meet my fellows in careful converse; as a student, I am companion in things high and hallowed with my fellow-students; as a teacher, I am to cull, collate, and bring to you things pertinent to today from the realm of truth.

I am then man, student and teacher in this newly adjusted compact.

And by the process of exclusion I find myself set apart to a special line of teaching called theological, having to do, as I understood it, with a certain clear and definite realm of thought—namely, the sphere of the soul and its media of life.

Furthermore, as clearly as the objective bounds of my province are marked out, equally sharp is my conception of the subjective relation which I obligate myself to assume towards this field of truth.

I am a Lutheran. I teach in a Lutheran School of Divinity. I apprehend theologic truth, therefore, from a definite historic viewpoint, which I am supposed to have considered with prayer and care, to have validated to my own conscience and to de-

\* Inaugural Address.

sire to propagate as my sincere, unequivocal, hearty and joyous personal faith. This supposition I herewith assume. And in this Reformation time with its clustering incident aromatic of our faith, I renew with a sense of exhilarating joy my whole and hearty adoption of the faith of the fathers as my faith—and the living principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as the basis of my belief and consequently of my instruction.

Neither is it a matter of little moment to me that I am to teach in Wittenberg, in Hamma Divinity Hall, institution and building alike redolent with the hope and faith of great men and godly—gone before, and of good men and true, still by the grace of God, with us to cheer, encourage and support.

Surveying now more carefully the characteristic of my own chair—the New Testament in its philologic and critical aspects—we need to recognize what view the Lutheran Church holds historically, and whether or not modern developments are of such character as to cause the Church to shift her base or to necessitate a re-adjustment of her relation so far as the Word of God is concerned.

Tremendous masses of theological literature are now being hurtled from the presses of both hemispheres. In the Eastern world as in the Western the lists of publications are in no small measure catalogued philosophico-theological. The book shops of Leipzig and Berlin exhibit a constantly increased number of printed discussions of fine acumen and characteristic scholarship on topics of New Testament import.

Fairly conversant for now a half dozen years with the book markets of the old world, I have been led to constantly marvel at their prolific and profound discussion. The *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung* and *Literatur-Blatt*, and *Jahres Bericht* will all astound their reader by the masses of matter there shown to be emanating from the press. And less than three months since Prof. Seeberg, of Berlin, in a personal conversation expressed to me his renewed hope for the Church amongst the upper classes of Germany because of the very fact that these publications evinced and confirmed a deep and growing interest upon the part of the reading classes in the religious things pertaining to the New Testament. And the burning point of discussion

is latterly largely upon this New Testament ground. The New Testament centers the field of this culture conflict. We may not escape it if we would.

Nor can the Professor in a Lutheran Theological School in the province of New Testament research stand apart from, or consider himself extraneous to whatever may be in the focus of scholarly vision in his department of thought. It would ill become the Lutheran ideal of exact though devout scholarship to elude or to ignore the passing storm of critical thought. Apart from the ethical inadmissibility of this position of indifferent negation, mental honesty and ecclesiastical equipoise would demand an effort at solutions.

Furthermore, the non-discussion of the questions of advanced criticism under a reliable guide opens to the unaided student large possibilities of error, and thus an unfortunate passing fancy may lightly become a permanent conviction.

Christianity is not independent of critical results. It cannot, therefore, ignore criticism without emasculating the Christian concept by denuding it of all positive content. Critical historical investigation has its right, the right of search for the truth.

But we maintain the right to put the question, Is there competency on the part of the human intellect to produce such certitude of result in the complicate human-divine problems as will define and demonstrate?

Some truth is yet inaccessible to the race, and I opine that the problems oftentimes undertaken by the pure critical spirit are entirely disproportionate to its capacity, infinitely incommensurate with the processes of investigation at the command of mortality, minify or magnify it as you may.

Criticism then in itself is not an evil but an aid and attendant of vitality and intensity. John requires that we 'prove' the spirits whether or no they be of God, and the Thessalonian Church is exhorted to 'test' all things, and Paul 'chief of the apostles' as he was, ascribed nobility to the Bereans because they 'searched Scripture'—indicating that the requisite searching of Christian faith is objective as well as subjective. Our Lord himself is constantly and sharply penetrative. The life and

teaching from Moses to the Maccabees passes under his analytic spirit. Wide is it from his aim to lower the border lines between fidelity and credulity that the former may be graded down to the latter. Hence a criticism reverent and discriminating is in a condition of life an essential. That which the Founder of Christianity and his apostles were obliged to utilize, must, doubtless, in the propagation of his teaching also have its place. Recognizing then from the very nature of the case this necessity, there remains to have regard to the canons of legitimate criticism and the bounds in which they may be applied.

Not in the bald sense in which it is sometimes asserted, is Scripture to be handled as any other text. "A glory gilds the sacred page, Majestic like the sun; It gives a light to every age, It gives, but borrows none." *Sui generis* is the Word in all Lutheran faith and theology. Its truth has its own self-evidencing authority. Over the low walls erected by philology, history and the mental categories, there rises with perennial power and pervasive presence the spiritual reality.

Masterful exegetical strength must be had. Linguistic paraphrase and parallel are to be drawn. Documentary collation and investigation need to be a feature of our daily thought. Lexical and classical minuteness dare not be lightly cast aside. The most monumental mentality may find here open place and instant space. Yet the uniqueness of the Word requires tests higher than these. Paul defines it in his Corinthian Epistle. Such an one is, he says, "spiritual."

Life defies bars and boundaries physical and mental alike. And the Christian Doctors, Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene and Reformation, were strong not alone nor indeed chiefly by classicism, but by profound understanding of the deep things of God, having been led into unlocked scriptures by the spirit of God.

Passing to the critic's task there is to be demanded of our work the *rationale* of sense. A microscopic disintegration of word and syllables, a minute vassicular reckoning of syllable and accent is not the first element of literary criticism either in or out of sacred writings. Rather do we require that the re-

lationship of part to whole, the discrimination of major and minor phrases and the grasping of the writer's purpose and plan, be presented to us. We insist that a heedless admixture of Biblical texts irrespective of age or authorship shall no longer insistently be urged upon us as coördinate and coequal witnessses. Insisting likewise that the Bible is the Word of God, the Lutheran Church by historical association naturally comes in close touch with the critical spirit. And to the critical study of the Word, the Lutheran Church must ever directly and consistently lend herself. Her genesis in the rehabilitation of the Word as her underlying principle over against the extravaganza of medieval glosses naturally places her. And unless she has shifted her Formal Principle, which God forbid, her position today ought to admit of no question. Always has the Lutheran Church held highest its reverence for the Word. Within the past week reading the autobiography of one of the strong men of the American Lutheran Church, I was filled with admiration at his constant appeal in the things personal and things public of a long, varied and versatile life to the Word of God. And I have often been struck in Lutheran Literature with this same persistent infusion of the Scripture text. Indeed I call you to witness that scarcely any other literature has maintained through long centuries this utter Scripture simplicity. From Franke at Halle to Frank of Erlangen, we find the same Scripture emphasis. In Tholuck's talks with his students, in Muhlenberg's diary, in the devotional literature since Luther, is this true. And as a theologic basis it belongs to the glories of our Church, this recognition of the Word as *His* Word. A very recent inquiry into collegiate Bible study in American higher institutions shows the Lutheran Church first in the percentage of matriculated students having a biblical curriculum.

Lutheran emphasis upon indoctrination of youth embodied in its schools and special pastoral functions in connection with youthful training call to mind more forcibly than words that our Church heartily encourages all healthy Bible study, accepts sincerely and without reservation the Scriptures as the Word of God, as the credible source of Divine revelation and as the



standard and measure of all churchly doctrine. And here we come in touch with another theory.

The hypothesis of historical development, seemingly omnivorous under the skillful Graf-and-Wellhausen propaganda is being metamorphosed, let us hope, into a more harmless ruminant.

Says Prof. Burns: "It fails signally when applied to the history of any nation of which we have any historical data. For progress, though a marked feature of the history of many people is never the product of an evolutionary process, but is largely the result of a creative energy of one or more personalities, such as King Alfred and Washington in government, Chaucer in literature, Bacon in science, and Luther and Wesley in religion."

There necessarily is advance in the conception of truth as it impinges upon the human soul in reiterated aphelion and perihelion; but this progression must lie within the eternally-statutory bounds of Evangelical deposit.

And the principal of merely natural development in religion vitiates the essential idea of inherent revelation.

Furthermore, the conclusions of Higher Criticism are at best indicative only of a higher or lower probability. And this conjectural criticism, largely of that type, excludes itself from the domain of science by its own processes.

Its theoretical affirmative or denial cannot possibly have the weight of clarified codification. The speculative discussion though mentally of profound value, however cautiously developed, subsumes otherwise unproven premises and must therefore result in contingencies or predictions, which latter are often synonymous with predilection.

The gospel is authoritative not only because many of its truths and concepts appeal to our self and soul, but rather in that—appealing or not—they remain the utterance and hence the oracle of God.

President Northrup wisely says: "The divergence is wide—between saying this thing is true because God said it, and God said this because it is true. The former carries with it

the certainty of thus saith the Lord. The latter is of no validity because many things may be true which God never said."

Coming to another phase of our relation to the New Testament, attention falls upon the text itself—that which literally to the eye is the Word. It, too, has its problems solved and solving.

Text Criticism there must be. Its validity inheres in its essential character. The necessity arises out of the limitations of transmission, either subjectively or objectively and its course, though at times marked by the fluctuating tendencies of passing vagaries and conditioned by the eddies of a temporary and occasionally temporizing impact, has nevertheless led towards safer, saner and more substantial ground.

Text Criticism is no science, but an art upon a scientific foundation. It is and must be therefore dissevered from any and all apologetic interest.

The Text Criticism of the New Testament has ground in the fact that the witnesses for the text in the early manuscript forms (Blass) show individuality and idiosyncrasy requiring for their explication and synthesis careful processes of correct thinking. To this end men have elaborated rules by and under which the numberless trifling and yet to be handled individual cases are brought under one view point and determined according to a definite actuality. The results of Text Criticisms have led to a great series of definite settlements in New Testament readings throughout.

The Lower or Textual Criticism deals with questions of text, while the Higher Criticism sets for its task the questions of authorship, sources, composition and general literary character. These groupings are not in their nomenclature entirely fortunate and have each lent themselves to abuse. No self-complacency need to attach to him who deals with authorship, no derogation is involved in the labors of the specialist of the text.

Both alike have their province equally legitimate, if not equally in honor.

To ascertain the true text of a document as originally written by the author is a most natural and necessary work.

To find the *ipsissima verba* of the truths given men through

apostolic hands is the desideratum of him who toils over mildewed and musty manuscripts and versions. His function is to recover the true form of the author's text, however varied and divergent may be the copies from which he makes his initiatory advances. Complex indeed are the matters involved. Autographs, and genealogies, corrupt texts and historic tendencies, ecclesiastical lineage and dogmatic predilection are a few of the elements whose criteria enter into and give character and weight to the finally formed conclusions.

Now, the Textual Criticism of the New Testament is, if possible, even more complicated than is customarily the case, even as it is more important. "It is," says Kenyon of the British Museum, "the most important branch of the science, because it has to do with a book the import of which is quite incommensurable with that of any other book in the world—and it is the most complicated, because the extant materials are incomparably more plentiful in number and more varied in kind than in any other instance."

Sophocles is preserved to us in perhaps one hundred copies. Aeschylus in not more than fifty manuscripts. The poems of Catullus are left us in but three extant copies, all from a single manuscript not earlier than the Fourteenth Century. The number of New Testament manuscripts in the Greek original now known, are more than three thousand and constantly increasing as Asiatic unearthings or European Library collations proceed with their work.

The translated copies of New Testament are also multiform and varied. More than one thousand copies of Syriac, Gothic, Ethiopic and Armenian, Coptic, and Syriac versions are in hand, and possibly nine thousand copies of the Latin Vulgate. Consider this enormous cloud of witnesses and note the heavy task of the scholar in his efforts in presenting the purest possible text to the Church and the world.

True in one point New Testament Manuscripts have a clear and marvelous advantage over those of the classics—in no other case is the interval of time between the composition of the book and the date of earliest extant manuscript so short as in that of the New Testament. Written in the first century,

our earliest manuscript is from the fourth, with an interval of, therefore, but two centuries or thereabouts. While our manuscripts of Terrence are at least seven hundred years later than his writing, of Horace nine hundred years, and the interval separating Plato from his work is thirteen hundred years, while Aeschylus, Sophocles and Aristophanes are one thousand—four hundred years earlier than the manuscripts we use of theirs in our colleges today.

So far as textual criticism is concerned, then, its task is to extract the actual words of apostolic dictation from the great mass of divergent manuscripts which preserve for us this work. It is a great and necessary task which neither Tischendorf nor Tregelles, Erasmus nor Burgon, Stephen nor Bengel, Westcott nor Hort, Blass nor Nestle have yet completed.

Here Philology has its place. It explains its problems. Since for the Christian there is no holy language, as for the Jews the Hebrew, for the Mohammedans the old Arabian, or for the Hindus the Sanscrit. The written Word is vesimal, conditoal. It is a means.

We come now to Scripture content. Realities inhering in the text. Yet rising above and beyond it.

The deeper connotation of the Word may be summarized by Browning's lines in reference to the Gospel of John :

" I never thought to call down fire on such  
But patient stated much of the Lord's life  
Forgotten or misbelieved, and let it work ;  
Since much that at the first, in deed and word,  
Lay simply and sufficiently exposed had grown  
Of new significance and fresh result  
What first were gussed as points, I now knew stars  
And named them in the gospel I have writ."

Christ holds the Old Testament as an infallible authority, having Himself come not to destroy the law or the prophets but according to his Word, to fulfil.

His apostles in like manner commend the teaching of Christ by repeated appeal to that Scripture which hath concluded all under sin.

To his own Word Jesus attributes a durability unknown to heaven and earth, and expressly also endorses in similar wise

the apostolic Word in, He that receiveth you receiveth me and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.

Similarly we find that the apostle's appeal to Christ's words as of binding authority.

For this we say unto you, says Paul to the Thessalonian Church, "by the Word of the Lord." And I command, says the same apostle to the Corinthians, "Yet not I but the Lord." And in the dramatic apostolic episode at Ephesus the great proto-missionary and martyr looking into the face of his Christian official brotherhood asserts—Wherefore I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel, not of pre-nor post-Aristotelian philosophers neither decretal nor edicta conciliorum, but all the council of God. I have showed you all things how that you ought to remember the words of the Lord Jesus how he said." But the apostles also claim even for their own words like authority. For to this end did I write, says Paul, that I might know the proof of you, whether you be obedient in all things. And again to the Thessalonians, Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you have been taught by word or our epistle.

Reiterated and emphatic are the New Testament citations to the (*graphai*).

The Apostolic Fathers likewise, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Hermas, Polycarp, Barnabas and the Didache regard the primacy of the things handed down. *Gegraptai*, it is written, is the introductory formula which with establishes the truth of a proposition.

The very words of Christ are the appellate court decisive in all controversy. Compare Ignatius' "of some who say—Unless I find it in the original of the gospel I do not believe, and when I said to them, it is written, they answered me, that settles it."

The Gospel, affirms Ignatius' again, is the flesh of Christ, the Apostles are the Presbytery of the Church.

Hence like authority is claimed for apostolic Word by the Fathers as for that of the Lord himself. "For what saith the Scripture?" inquires Paul of the Romans.

The patristic writings abound in references to all the New Testament. Justin, Irenaeus and Clement and Seeberg's edition of the *Homily of Aristides* confirm the facts that all alike of the New Testament books were read in the early assemblies for worship. And at the close of the second century the Anti-Gnostic Fathers assert their recognition of the authority of the New Testament as having been always prevalent in the Church.

Thus up and down the early centuries in Christian circles men hold to a perpetual supersensuous worth in the words of our Lord and his apostles. Their message is divine. The word written is of the same stuff as the word spoken. Thesis and anti-thesis alike validated the record of Revelation.

Yet the Church has always predicated its right of judgment both upon what are the Scriptures and their interpretation. For several centuries there existed differences concerning the contents of the New Testament and this even by those who were one in the recognition of the importance of the apostolic writings. The Canon of scripture had a varied value and content according to its geographical position. The Book of visions, the so-called Shepherd, appeals to Irenaeus as a sacred writing from which he deduced homily and upon which he founded dogma precisely as though it had the Prophetic authority. In the Codex Sinaiticus, that glorious find of Tischendorf, in St. Petersburg, one may today see the Epistle of Barnabas attached to Sacred Writings. Multiplied instance of the sort evidences the very gradual harmonization of the New Testament Canon, with the excision and rejection of dubious addenda.

Through the influence of Augustine, Athanasius and Hieronymus, through the inter-relation and conference of the several churches themselves and through synodal decree, the Christian world of the sixth century possessed our present New Testament. Thus six centuries were required until the self-evidencing *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* confirmed itself wholly to the Church.

The Church was seeking as it is today through the Word, Christ and his Christianity.

And when the Reformation with its abounding faith and

super-abounding life appeared upon the scene, the canon did not fail to receive its share of attention. Luther's position is well known. On the one hand he appeals to the apostolic authorship, that is, *historical* criticism, on the other with his unerring spiritual intuition he also demands proof of a writing's evangelical tendency, that is, inner criticism. At the Leipzig disputation, when confronted by Eck with James' words, "faith without works is dead," Luther answered in the resolutions—first, the style of this epistle is very inferior to the apostolic majesty and cannot be compared with that of Paul, and again he protested—and his Hermeneutics here are good—against the overemphasizing of a single verse of the Bible in contradistinction to the entire teaching of Scripture.

The Roman Church finally at the Council of Trent formulated its decretals on the Scripture Canon, giving equal authority to Scripture and Tradition, enumerating the books of the Canon and including the apocrapha and finally pronouncing an anathema upon all who would not accept this book and all these parts as contained in the Latin Vulgate. Now over against the Roman Church we, says Zahn, heed the voice of God as it speaks to us in the sacred Scriptures, ever ready to learn to be corrected and therefore to advance.

Our Church has not ceased in the sixteenth century, nor even in the nineteenth, the diligent study of the gospels born of the faith in the same. "For this reason every final judgment was omitted from its confession concerning the single writings, texts, and letters which contain their normative 'Word of God.'"

Nevertheless omitting from its confession all human speculations concerning the ways and means of God's presence in his Word, our Church has confessed gladly and unitedly its allegiance to the revelation of God in Holy Scripture.

Not closing the door to earnest investigation of the Scripture, their content and character, our Confessions are yet most explicit.

"We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic

and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament. Other writings of ancient and modern teachers whatever reputation they may have should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scripture, but should altogether be subordinated to them and should not be received other or farther than as witnesses in what manner and at what places, since the time of the apostles the doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved." So far the Confession. Thus the Lutheran Church then by its exhibit of faith conserves inspiration, while by its genesis and history it remains free from both Roman and Reformed embarrassments.

Zahn and Jacobs alike coincide in the impossibility of mere naturalistic criticism discerning the deep things of God through His Word. And Tischendorf, that prince of New Testament students, has well said 'Erudition has never had the key to the kingdom of God.' Or may we add with Dr. Jacobs, one may know Hebrew like the Rabbis of old, or Greek like the philosophers who heard Paul on the Areopagus without being a competent judge concerning the Old or New Testament.

Knowledge of two languages alone will not make a competent translator—there must be added a sense of the situation or comprehension of the life in which he works.

No one is competent, remarks Phillip, to judge of the divine origin, truth, clearness and sufficiency of the Word unless he hath experienced the enlightening and quickening power.

The Bible both is the Word of God and contains the Word of God—and the elucidation of these truths belongs to the spiritually impelled scholarship of every age that the Gospel may freshly tell its message and apply its proffered healing.

It belongs to Scripture and the Lutheran Confession then, that properly founded criticism should exercise itself. Nay, the Church must guard the right with a vigilance and a non-faltering determination.

The individualistic modern Negative Criticism may not have run its course, though we do read of the Bankruptcy of Higher Criticism, it may not even have reached its high water mark, though one following closely of late the current of thought,



marking the transfer of Professor Harnack from his Berlin University Academic chair to a librarian's position, noting the weariedness and lack of virility of recent Negative writings, cannot but note many eddies and shallows which in the impetuous sweep of several years ago were not to be seen. But our position is not to be influenced by the daily meteorological report whatever may be the readings of barometer, thermometer or hygrometer.

I account it more scientific to follow the current leadings of nineteen hundred years of history rather than the aberration of the last fifty.

Very recently one critic states of another: "He heaps conjecture upon conjecture and they remain mere conjectures notwithstanding his constant assurance that this is clear and that is without doubt. Surely Dr. W. J. Beecher is correct in insisting that in matters of permanent knowledge an expert does not expect to be believed permanently on the ground of being an expert. He is under obligation to put it into the power of men who are not experts to test his conclusions."

This Negative Criticism has not done. And yet for all its subjectivity—it handles no less roughly. It touches the fundamentals of our faith in sapping the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus the Christ. And emptying the office of the Holy Spirit. Guidance into all truth becomes a shadowy figment, or at best a leading by the human hand of a very unsteady-stepping, hazy-minded pedestrian.

The Rev. Hugh Black, of Edinburgh, says Higher Criticism is no longer a question with us. It has been left behind. The "*Victory consisted in the Church permitting room for textual criticism upon knowledge that the truth of God's Word does not depend on mere verbalities.*"

The Tübingen school of Bauer and his successors, asserts that the "task of the historical method is to investigate whatever happens under the relation of cause and effect." This basis of criticism is a *petitio principii* in that it wholly eliminates the consideration of the Biblical moral system. It is a speculation with diverse and many colored coats, a futile attempt to forget the intellectual limitations of the mind. By making

reason the absolute and final test of religious knowledge, it throws out the moral convictions as of no value in solving its own problems. Thus distinctly the Negative Higher Criticism is unscientific because it eliminates the facts of Christian experience produced by the New Testament in the hearts of men while science must take into account all facts.

Historically also it is unscientific owing to its obscure and uncertain grounds of its data, as well as to the philosophical interpretation of these facts. Traditionalism is discounted by Pantheism or Naturalism. Celsus and Porphyry, Hobbes and Spinoza, Strauss and Renan, with their conscious and unconscious disciples, ally themselves to the principle of the reduction of Christianity to the basis of a natural religion. From this as New Testament students we dissent.

"Criticism is," we agree with Professor Mead, "nothing but search after truth and of this there cannot be too much," but objection is properly taken to highly prejudiced use of it in the devisive criticism which takes all books into the dissecting room of suppositious authors, or the *destructive* criticism which postulates the merely probable and then coolly proceeds to undermine the foundation.

The faulty fallibility of the Negationists is caustically characterized by Comparatti :

"This restless business of analysis which has lasted so long impatient, of its own fruitlessness, yet unconvinced of it, builds up and pulls down and builds up again, while its shifting foundations, its insufficient and falsely applied criteria, condemn it to remain fruitless, tedious and repellant. The observer marks with amazement the degree of intellectual short-sightedness produced by excessive and exclusive analysis. The investigator becomes a kind of microscope man who can see atoms, but not bodies, motes—and those magnified—but not beams."

Indeed in precisely a similar manner in a personal conversation last summer in Berlin Professor Seeberg expressed himself to me—characterizing such men, as those who could not see the forest for the trees.

So far then as Negation is concerned Bishop Lightfoot correctly surmises that the historical sense of the seventeenth or

eighteenth century is larger and truer than the critical insight of a section of men in our late half century.

We treat the New Testament as literature, but as literature written at the command of God and under the guidance of God and preserved by the Providential care of God.

To the Old Documentary Hypothesis of Eichhorn and Astruc, to the Fragmentary Hypothesis of Geddes, Hartman and Vette, to the Supplementary Hypothesis of DeWette, Bleek and Ewald, to the New Documentary Hypothesis of Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen, to the Evolutionary Hypothesis of Hegel and Spencer, systems in principles alike for both Old and New Testament, we cannot subscribe.

To the principles which, inverting the pyramid, base the first eighteen centuries and their mental and moral culture upon the last twenty-five years, to the criteria reconstructing by redaction the theologic groundwork of travailing generations, to the plausibilities offered us in return for the dislocation of fixed fact and the dissipation of a final faith, to the utter evasion of confessional statement and the blithe ignoring of the Christian leadership of the ages, to the false idealism which undermining the sober judgment of truth and fact, substitutes therefor the so called 'value judgment' originating in one's own desires, to uncertainties based on psychology as the obverse of certainties founded on faith, we cannot subscribe.

Believing with Canon Liddon that "The Book of Truth cannot belie either the law of truth or the spirit and source of truth," our teaching will affirm and posit, rather than negate by "conjectural emanation." And in thus doing we shall have honored fellowship with such men as Cremer, of Griefswald, Zahn, of Erlangen, Walther, of Rostock, Ramsey, of England, Gregory, of New York, and Warfield, of Princeton, of our own sainted Doctor Gotwald, Doctor Wolf, of Gettysburg, Piefer, of St. Louis, Weidner, of Chicago, Schodde, of Columbus, Jacobs and Schmauck, of Philadelphia, and the sympathetic coöperation, I take it, of our honored colleges. No mean cloud of witnesses these.

Truth must be self-consistent while expressions of the same truth dare not be contradictory. The identity of truth may

have varying statements and we need to beware in our study of Scripture lest we fail to discriminate here. Is the lack of self-consistency rather perhaps resident not in the Book but in the mind studying it. If this be the case, then we dare hold fast the integrity of the Bible. If the error is in the Word, its value is destroyed and our faith falls, but if—as two thousand years fairly testify—the difficulty lies in the personality of the student, his lack of knowledge, and want of grasp and failure in applying the Spirit of truth for instruction and guidance, then indeed the substratum of our hope is Rock foundation and our primitive age is not azoic.

Witnesses are multiplying for the positive position in New Testament ground. At home and abroad History is being re-established by archeological research. One cannot visit the British Museum with its wealth of Oriental brick libraries now deciphering, nor the new archeological galleries of Berlin and Rome without a deeper realization of the mighty work of restoration now in process.

The Stone of Ammon, the Rosetta Stone, the recent discovery of the Amarna letters in Lower Egypt, the Harrammabbi Table of laws, these all from six thousand years ago to yesterday are searchlights of Biblical progress.

Discoveries like these have rehabilitated Homer, vindicated Herodotus and the great Bible and Babel discussion of the last two years puts into our hands scores of new weapons.

True, we need deep and long study that we may know how to use these new weapons lest we be as David encased in Saul's armor. Doubtless much more digging and burrowing remain to be done. Much land remains to be surveyed. The axe must be laid to the root of the tree. Toil and oil are called for. Archeology will offer its treasures. History will furnish its persistent and unanswerable witness. Prejudice will be disarmed and Weinl, Bousset and Trötsch may yet stack arms in the same camp with Seeberg, Franke and Cremer. But in the meantime we hew to the line.

It may be that a Q. E. D. cannot ever be placed at the close of every paragraph, sentence, word and doctrine of New Testament text or faith. What of it? It is impregnable for what

it stands—Jesus Christ made manifest. The Christian consciousness will constantly be called upon for interpretations and solutions, fitting new niches of historic framework as the architecture of History builds. And this consciousness divinely fed and under the sure training of the historic consensus of the faith will be satisfied.

The Constructive Criticism, then, for which in the glorious freedom of the twentieth century we stand, is based solely on a faith which is true without consideration of other ground save that God hath said it.

This is the resultant of our cumulative argument sustaining our conservative Lutheran position.

And hence we may feel in building character and hope thereon that though the Heaven and earth pass away yet "the Word of the Lord shall endure forever."

To this end then—our teaching. In this conviction—our faith. A conviction strong for the Herculean task confronting American Lutheranism.

It is told of Heinrich Heine that one day as he stood pensive in the midst of one of Europe's great Cathedrals and looking upward at the beauty and harmony of the whole mighty pile, he said to his companion: "You see here the difference between opinions and convictions. Opinions could never build such a structure as this. Convictions can."

So based upon the Word of God as a literature unique, *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum*, buttressed by the Confession of the Church, those conserving testimonies to its historic heart beat, and confidently appealing from the human natural to the Divine natural, the chair of the New Testament Philology and Criticism of Wittenberg Theological Seminary will, I take it, maintain the utter and absolute integrity of the Word of God, the faith once delivered to the saints.

And our Academic counsel shall be that of Luther in his wholesome comment upon a Word of our Lord—See that ye study the Scripture so as to seek and find me in them. Who-soever does not find me there, he has not studied nor understood them aright. Even though he were to read them a thousand times and were continually to turn their pages, all would be to no purpose. But he who reads them so as to find me, is the true master of Scripture. The dust is away from his eyes and he will certainly find in them eternal life.

## ARTICLE IV.

## AN INTERROGATION OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

BY REV. A. B. BUNN VAN ORMER, A.M.

In the absence of a committee whose duty it might be to suggest to the appointee the line of thought desired, in the view of lines of thought previously presented; in the absence of any record of themes previously presented, the whole realm of educational thought, for the Church may well make the whole realm a matter of concern to herself, lies before one asked to give this annual address. There are many things that interest and that would be well worth while, that one might wish to bring for consideration. But, compelled to make a choice from the several lines that for one reason or another make a personal appeal, we have chosen to make *An Interrogation of Christian Education*.

We wish to ask of Christian Education, as it is organized and operative in practice, if it has so examined its organization and its methods of procedure as to have fully satisfied itself that it is not self-antagonistic; that is, not contributing to a growth of certain character traits which Christian Education in later life must antagonize, must try to neutralize—character traits whose presence in the individual or in society effectually block the fuller coming of the kingdom, for which the Master taught us daily to pray; for which the world is really, if unconsciously, yearning.

No fondness for paradox gives form to this interrogation. Its form is necessitated by the conditions that exist.

There is to be seen in the educational world a tendency to magnify things of the letter, things that are external, incidental, that have to do almost exclusively with means and methods. So strong is this tendency that many seem at times to lose sight of the fact there are things of the spirit, internal, fundamental and which look to the end to be attained, that attach them-

selves to matters of education. There are educational things of the letter. Between them there arise antagonisms, whereby the literal, "practical" (so called), often counteracts, or makes inoperative, the spiritual, the valuable, the eternal.

The species bears the stamp of the genus. The same tendency is seen in matters of Christian Education. There is danger of magnifying the importance of organization, of equipment, of curriculum, etc., till the deeper things are overlooked. There is danger of so emphasizing the letter as to overlook, or ignore, the spirit.

Thus there have come to be two conceptions of education, two conceptions of religious education: the one being satisfied with the surface, the tangible, the ponderable things; the other, not neglecting but duly subordinating these things, concerns itself with the things that lie below the surface, that are intangible, imponderable, the things worth while.

Christian Education of the latter kind looks beyond, back of, over the external marks of Christian Education of the former kind, until it finds the heart-motive. To this it presents its appeal, not so much—and not at all exclusively—by means of direct appeal, exhortation and preaching (save in the church phase of Christian Education). It rather so safeguards and subordinates its organization and all its methods of procedure as to afford occasion thereby for the development of such motives as are consistent with the product and the sure marks of love for Jesus Christ—a love that shall manifest itself in obedience to the two tables of the second commandment. "Love thyself; thy neighbor as thyself." Whatever else may be done or attempted in the name of Christian Education, an effort to develop altruism as the dominant life-motive must not be neglected. Though everything else be done, failure here marks the failure of education that claims to be distinctively Christian. But to fail to develop altruism is to develop egoism, against which the Church of Christ is commissioned to wage a warfare of annihilation.

The interrogation asks if Christian education may not at times be self-antagonistic.



The pertinence of this interrogation appears, in part, when we reflect upon the comparative absence of altruism from the motives that predominate in society. We see it in the commercial and industrial worlds: the rights of millions are tramped upon while egoism battles with egoism, both combatants alike indifferent to the absolute needs of the millions; recent publications make plain the processes whereby most of the vast accumulations of wealth have been made—processes that have back of them a disregard for the rights of man, the laws of man, and the laws of God; processes which have entailed suffering, hardship and wreckage, financial, moral, spiritual, for many. We see it in the political world, where the idea of a call to public service has been prostituted and we have instead a seeking for office by methods that undermine both public and private morality and that deprive us of representation, save in its semblance. Egoism in politics is rapidly making a farce of our boasted, but we fear too little valued, republico-democratic principles of self-government in the interests of the common weal. "Is it not true," asks Colonel Parker, the lamented educational leader, in vigorous but fully justified rhetorical interrogation, "Is it not true that if we as citizens could go to the polls and vote for public servants with a complete or reasonable conviction that our candidates love their country more than they love themselves, we should be profoundly happy?"

In connection with this lamentable absence of altruism, the pertinence of our interrogation still further appears in the fact that, for a long period of years, Christian Education, as found in home, and school, and Church, and in Christian lives with their potency, has been operative, privileged the while to counteract all this; even commissioned to do so. Men who are captains of sociologically iniquitous industries, men who are serving self and not the common good, who are debauching manhood, and who know no moral restrictions to the reaching of their ambitions, these men, many if not all of them, have at some time been in touch with Christian Education and have come away with egoism abnormally developed. Many of them are professing Christians.



Has Christian Education ever been so organized as to have contributed to this result? Is it in any respect and at any place so organized as to be a profitable contributor to this result to day? Must not the answer be an affirmative one? If so, the pertinency of the interrogation is apparent.

This affirmative answer has reference to Christian Education in its several phases, as it is found in some homes, in some schools, in some Bible schools. In some schools we find prizes, honors, class standings, commencement distinctions, etc., extensively employed as incentives to effort or to good behavior. Catalogs announce them, teachers refer to them, pupils talk of them, wish for them and some work for them—honestly or otherwise (often otherwise). In the homes we hear these things spoken of, comparisons of children made, winners lauded—an atmosphere in fact that leaves no room to doubt the things expected of the children in the homes. Nor is the Bible school willing to be out-done. With its rewards and prizes and tickets, with its class rivalries for attendance or contribution banners, with its devices whereby the child may be induced to part with his money and thus swell the school or church board treasury, the Bible school is a close second, if not the victor, in the mad race away from the real and vital interests of the child.

The system of extraneous rewards and inducements in educational work is of English university origin, and did not originate with the Sunday School as has been claimed by some. From the same source, comes the most famous argument in the system's favor. An outline of this argument is presented as the basis of an examination of the system's reason for being:

*Proposition I.* Intellectual improvement depends on what one does for himself.

*Proposition II.* This doing for one's self is for a long time painful. The great problem of education is to induce a pupil to endure this pain until he reaches a pleasurable stage.

*Proposition III.* A stimulus is necessary for a season to counteract the pain of exertion, "to induce the pupil to endure, etc."

*Proposition IV.* Emulation and love of honor constitute the appropriate stimulus in education.

The first proposition, that intellectual development depends on what one does for himself, asserts an educational commonplace, recognized and used by all skillful teachers.

But this proposition, fundamental to the argument, contains a fallacy that reigns almost supreme in educational circles. The preëminence given to the intellect and its development has made possible many a practice that otherwise would meet with peremptory challenge, at times on ethical grounds. As if there were no other function of mind, as if society today more needs intellectual culture than it needs development of Christian morality, largely a matter of the heart and will, we have concerned ourselves with intellectual culture to the serious neglect of heart and will, at times to the negative development of these phases of life; for it is possible for "the intellect to grow wise while the heart grows wicked," as Horace Mann contends.

The second proposition, asserting that this self-effort is painful for awhile and then becomes pleasurable is, so far as the painful feature is concerned, an assertion of what has been and of what often is the case, rather than an assertion of what could be and of what should be the case. This proposition as an assertion of what should be the accompaniment of intellectual activity is psychologically antiquated. The later psychology contends that "while the love of knowledge takes its rise in a painful feeling—the sense of ignorance or perplexity—it is greatly reinforced by the pleasurable feelings which accompany the attainment of knowledge." (Sully). Intellectual exertion not carried to the point of fatigue is pleasant, it healthful, teaches the same authority. "The fact is," writes Dr. Search, "only our methods of approach are distasteful—truth is always attractive. The rich realm of learning is full of pure delight." \*

Proposition three asserts the need of a stimulus (extraneous is taken for granted) to counteract the pain of exertion. But any little pain, strain, sense of obstacles that might accompany

\* Educational Review, Lib. '96-141.

a quest of truth would be naturally counteracted by the hope of success, by the prevision of the truth as the learner draws consciously nearer and nearer to it, by the emotional concomitant of the intellectual exertion, and by the joy of conquest of truth at the end of the process. Why then an extraneous stimulus?

Proposition four makes of emulation and love of honor the appropriate stimulus in education. No one has ever denied to emulation the right to be ranked as a stimulus. It is a potent one. This fact has never been better understood than by the Jesuits, the past-masters in the use of the stimulus. Fitting stimulus it is for them with their principle of ignored instrumentalities in view of the importance of the end. If our wish is to set a few to intense effort to reach each before the other an artificial goal which at best proclaims that the winner has but outstripped another regardless of how it was done, regardless of whether or not he has done his best—if this is our wish, we shall find in emulation the shortest way to the attainment of that wish. Yes, emulation is a stimulus; but it is a stimulus that has found no sanction in *the world's greatest text book on Education—the Bible*.

This argument under consideration contains a fallacy that finds no explicit statement in connection with the several propositions. If explicitly stated it would read "during the painful stages use a powerful stimulus, extraneous, until the pleasurable stages are reached when the stimulus will no longer be necessary, being replaced by the pleasure incident to the efforts put forth. The error of dissociating the pleasure and pain in the process of acquiring knowledge we have seen. The two chase each other through the various stages of acquisition. But for the sake of argument, grant the dissociation contended for by the illustrious author of this defense of the system of extraneous stimulation. The fallacy persists. The stimulus used during the assumed painful stage will not be easily dispossessed. To contend that it will be is to encounter two stubborn facts. The first of these is the law of *habituation of motive*, asserting that the longer one works under the stimulus of a given motive, the less likely he is to be swayed by any other motive that

might try to displace the one to which he has become habituated. The second fact is that of the refutation of the fallacy by experience with extraneous stimulation. Where has it been found that the stimulus can be removed? It is often applied in the home. Does the secular school remove it, the Bible school, the high school, the college, the university? What a long drawn-out painful period must be passed through! How far off the pleasurable stage! The experience of Mr. Lawrence in his Bible school is pertinent. The Robert Raikes Diploma, described as "a beautiful lithographed diploma, 14x17 inches, designed by the author some twenty years ago," is given for a year of perfect record. For each of six succeeding years a seal is given until the diploma represents seven years of perfect record. And then the thing of present interest. We quote: "Hundreds of members having earned and received the Robert Raikes Diploma with all its seals, made it necessary to inaugurate something else, *lest they lose their interest*. We consequently introduced what is known as the Robert Raikes Alumni Diploma. \* \* \* This is much larger and handsomer than the Robert Raikes Diploma, being 19x24 inches in size, beautifully lithographed in four colors upon heavy bond paper." \*

Having thus been led through the painful stage of Sunday School work, the pupil is ready to go to Sunday School for the pleasure there is in it. But no, some pain still lingers. The Alumni Diploma provides for twelve more annual seals, each required (reasoning from the author's reason for the existence of the Alumni Diploma) "*Lest they lose their interest*."

Unconvinced by the argument, unswayed by the name of its distinguished author, we continue to press our interrogation of Christian Education; and in pressing it, we bring against the system of extraneous reward, incentive, stimulus, whether it is employed by the church or school or home, taking the form of emulation and of competition as it unavoidably does, the following accusations:

*We accuse* the system of laying on the majority of those un-

\* (How to Conduct a S. S. 163-4).

der its sway additional and unnecessary burdens. What of stimulation is to be gotten from the fact that one helps to form the dull background whereby the brightness of the foreground may be made apparent? Stimulus! what a mockery the word to a pupil of ordinary power, of sluggish mental process! The consciousness of one's deficiency is not often classed as an instrument of stimulation.

*We accuse* the system of contributing in many instances to an overpressure in education that undermines health and robs society of some of its potentially most useful members. Overpressure's victims are to be found at all ages of school-life. Dr. Talbot in his work on Degeneracy says: "In children emotional conditions, school strain, rivalry between classmates, are as liable to produce neurasthenia as are the struggles for existence in later life." Elsewhere the same author says, "It is the spirit of emulation with its attendant alternation of worry and hope that causes so many of the acquired nervous disorders of the adult, and which *obviously is much more potent with children.*" When we recall in this connection Prof. Lombroso's contention that, unlike the lower organisms, the individuals most fit to survive and to bless humanity are the ones that are most likely to be injured, we see that society's loss is much more than a matter of mere numbers. Literature has seen the danger. Dickens in *Dombey and Son* has given us a classic on overpressure. And you will easily locate the following paragraph from a present-day author: "It was a low-rooted room with a box, bed and some pieces of humble furniture, fit only for a laboring man (we regret the implication of this clause). But the choice treasures of Greece and Rome lay on the table, and on a shelf beside the bed college prizes and medals, while everywhere were the roses he loved. His peasant mother stood beside the body of her scholar son." It is between the lines we read the accusation against educational overpressure operating through emulation. One such life of promise as was that of Geordie Hoom is too much of a social loss. In 1899 at the midsummer distribution of prizes by the University of London, Dr. Alexander Hill was the speaker. He took as his text the

system of offering rewards for scholarship and severely arraigned it. The first contention in his arraignment was that the system "increases temptation to overwork." His audience thought him facetious and laughed, at first, at his contention. *They ended by cheering his utterances.*

*We accuse* the system of making the intellectual the supreme thing in life and of developing it, at times, at the expense of the emotional and volitional functions of life. This accusation can not be substantiated so far as the theory of education goes. We point to the actual practices for substantiation of it.

We accuse the system of displacing a natural incentive to effort by an artificial one, thus deadening real interest in the subject for its own sake, for the sake of its life—serviceability. There is a danger that the one thus stimulated artificially may not have a real and sincere interest in life, that his concern may be with life's superficial things because of which he shall miss the true meaning and the true joy of life.

We accuse the system of placing before students a temptation to resort to unfair means, and we aver from observation and from hearsay what few if any of us do not know to be a fact, that many students yield to the temptation and resort to unfair means, impelled thereto by the hope of surpassing others, or of making a more creditable personal showing. Are these things to which we dare be indifferent? Shall we set up a special standard of educational ethics by which indulgences are granted for all sorts of wrong whilst one is in school or college? What shall we say of the synodically aided student for the ministry who with dark lantern and a tried companion seeks (and finds and uses) the matter for the Greek examinations of the following morning? What shall we say of the ingenuity of deception, of acted falsehood, by which coveted standing and rank and distinction are sought for, and often obtained, without the installment payments of honest efforts through the term? Can it be that the system is all right and the students all wrong? Does the blame rest properly and solely upon the students in their total depravity? Or shall we enlarge our conception of depravity so as to include in it the system that tempts as well

as the students who yield to the temptation? Homes often help along the evil we are deploring. Many a child carries to school work his parents have done and for which he is credited. With such credits he wins place and class and school distinction. We have heard of a literary parent, a clergyman, who corrected his son's essays before the essays were presented for the criticism and *the credit* of the professor of English. What shall we say of a system that thus tempts young people and parents to close their eyes to delicate ethical distinctions? How shamefully unequal the competition between the child who has no one at home able to do his work for him and the *cultured parent of blunted ethical sense* who enters the competition by means of a child used as a proxy?

We accuse the system of cultivating egoism and anti altruism, the motives with which Christian education must contend so vigorously and with so little progress toward final conquest; the motives which grievously afflict society and rob the individual of the joy that comes from the indwelling of altruism, of the Christ motive. If the system's appeals are at all responded to, the responses one by one contribute to the growth of the anti social motives, each response leaving the student more self-centred than he was before responding. What might be could we rid ourselves of the system so almost universally in vogue is a matter of inference. Yet to those who believe in altruism as the supreme motive of life, as the crux of the Master's social teachings, how thrilling the prospect of an absence of this system! There seems to be a time when the adolescent is peculiarly open to the cultivation of altruism, when he thrills with interest in others and when the motive might be fixed for life. But at this time he is subjected to the artificial system and is made to be self considering. By the laws of imitation, of suggestion, of the social atmosphere, of the sanction of those looked up to as guides and leaders and friends, he is led, beguiled, driven, into self-considering channels which go not through fields of altruism.

We accuse the system of presenting to the young and immature false ideals of life, giving them distorted and grotesque



notions of success, a false perspective of life's opportunities and duties. The law of the potency of ideals holds as well for false and negative ideals as for true and positive ones, with this difference—the negative ones actualize themselves in conjunction with the moral gravitation of the race, and therefore along the lines of least resistance and easily; the positive ones must counteract this gravity-pull-downward and therefore actualize themselves with difficulty. If we give erroneous ideals we must expect them to bring forth their corresponding life activities and to persist with a baffling obstinacy even when one is awakened to their negative character. Nor is this all. These errors of life attitude, of ideal, of dominant motive are strangely self-perpetuating. They go out into homes and schools and Church, there to multiply their kind.

We accuse the system of making necessary many a life-long battle with the lower in one's self after the vision of the higher has been given to him, and of making more difficult the Holy Spirit's work of sanctification in a life that has in earlier years been habituated to the system's motive.

If any of us hold the biologic conception of mental development and believe with Lowell that

"From the lower to the higher next,  
Not to the highest is Nature's text."

if we believe with him in the analogy of the tadpole's tail, to such we accuse the system, contending that it interferes with this very process. The interference is seen not as is so often the case in the cutting off of the tail in a vain effort to hurry the development of the legs. It reverses the order, preventing the development of the legs by making the tail a permanent feature. The period of selfishness out of which and by means of which, on this theory, there should be a growth into the weaker altruism and then into the higher and higher stages of it, is so prolonged and the development of selfishness is so abnormal, that no energy is left for altruism; it remains but rudimentary, to tell of what should have been.

There are in recent educational literature two apparent defenses of the system under consideration; one by Dr. Gordy in



his "Briefer Elementary Education," the other by Prof. Griggs in his "Moral Education." If these could be shown to be sane defenses of the system in the intense form in which it is employed, they could be replied to by the fact that neither author is interested, professedly, in education that is marked off as distinctively Christian. But these are not defenses of the system arraigned.

Dr. Gordy's defense of emulation is a defense of emulation of so mild a kind that it differs by but very little from imitation. He gives to emulation as an emotional coloring the feeling of stress because of inferiority. He grants that this dislike of inferiority may easily develop into a desire for superiority and that the self-regarding character of emulation very clearly allies with the combative, aggressive tendency of a child. He sees the danger. When we read, "Deal with the child in such a way that he will wish not to emulate unworthy examples," we can not by predetermined effort find even between the lines a defense of the system as it is operative many places under the sanction of Christian Education.

But when Prof. Griggs says "even prizes may have a place" and refers to "the modern reaction against their use," the advocate of the system may feel that he has found a standing place. He is doomed to disappointment. The context adds \* \* \* "—— their occasional therapeutic value. To have this value they must give as rarely and as carefully as a physician gives a physical stimulant, and we must never let them be substituted for the real nourishment of the moral life. Moreover, their use is helpful, not when given for superior natural endowments, but when they are used to stimulate sincere effort. With these restrictions, it is possible to make them a temporarily helpful if an altogether subordinate element in furthering moral growth." The validity of the analogy between the physician and the one entrusted with the moral culture of a child is open to serious objections. But granting the significance attached to it by Prof. Griggs, the system is condemned. The restrictions demanded do not exist in practice, would take from the system all that now characterizes it, and would require a much higher degree of professional

efficiency than is required in the employment of the existent system.

As if by way of salving a hurt conscience, Christian Education at times bewails the condition of things as they are in society today and interests itself in a remedy. This interest not infrequently runs in the channel of criticism of the public school and exhausts itself in an effort to have the Bible read and prayer offered in the school.

This procedure is too fallacious to be an answer to the interrogation we are making.

It is fallacious in that it throws the burden on the public school, where in justice it should rest most lightly. The public school is but one of several factors operating to bring about social conditions. It is just as illogical for the other factors to accuse the public school of failure and of recreancy to high duty and privilege, as it would be for the public school to so accuse the other factors; even more so. For the public school is, in large measure, a product of the other factors. For home and church to accuse the public school is for them to accuse themselves. Some of the most baneful features of the public school today exist because of the attitude of the community, of the demands made by the homes. The public school today sees visions whose materialization will be long deferred because of the community life, of business standards, of political ideals and practices—yes and because of a heritage of ideals and of traditions passed down to it by institutions existing as exponents of Christian Education.

There is danger of being satisfied with the formal. The reading of the Bible in the schools may or may not be the blessing we wish. Certain it is that it is possible by example to give the lie to precept, by personality to beget contempt for precept. There is something better than the legal, compulsory use of the Bible, so apt to be perfunctory. This better thing is the legal privilege to use the Bible, and the selection of such teachers as will, out of their love for the Bible, their appreciation of its value, *choose to use it*. More than the Bible in the schools is there need of the embodiment of its teachings in the lives of those in charge of education. Let us

not deceive ourselves with externals, with the letter. One can conceive of schools exerting a positive moral and religious influence though denied the privilege of using the Bible. Likewise is it possible to conceive of schools using the Bible and yet exerting an influence that makes not for righteousness.

Are we disposed to ask why this system, existing by the sanction of Christian education, has been allowed to exist, and does now exist? We shall find the answer in large part in the assertion that the system has so securely intrenched itself because it moves along the line of least resistance, fixing its attention on things more easily attainable and choosing the easiest way possible of attaining unto them—more or less disregarding all other considerations.

It is much easier for a mother wishing to have a child take disagreeable medicine to achieve the result by saying, "If you do not take it I will give it to John,"\* than to have previously developed the habit of doing things that ought to be done. It is a much easier thing to pay pupils for effort, for behavior of a proper kind than it is to secure effort and behavior through previous development. It may be the easiest way of having Bible verses stored in the minds of children to resort to a commercial transaction in card board, red, yellow and blue, redeemable later on. But Mr. Riley's lines

"E'en these tickets, blue and red,  
For the Bible verses said—  
Such as these his memory kept,—  
Jesus wept."

show that the motive may be sordid, and the end "the tickets blue and red." Mr. Clemens in *Tom Sawyer* points out another possibility of the S. S. ticket, that of speculation. A picture of Luther or of Dr. Barnitz, given for a stipulated contribution, may increase the amount of money a Board will receive, but we question whether such methods will at all contribute to the development of the benevolent spirit in the next generation of church members. (A spirit from an over-development of which we do not suffer at the present time).

There can be no question of the simplification of class-room

\* Horace Mann gives the instance.

processes where the system of extraneous stimulus, in some one or more of its various forms, prevails. But there are some other things that exist along with this simplification that raise a serious question as to its desirability, so far as the pupils' good is concerned.

The system exists largely by virtue of its nonresistance, as well as by the sanction that it has from hoary traditions.

And yet, although the system has the sanction of hoary and almost universal tradition, that sanction is not universal. In all ages protest has been made against the system.

William Cowper in his *Review of Schools* arraigned the system in the latter part of the 18th century. Setting forth the defects of the system, he wrote.

"But judge where so much evil intervenes,  
The end, though plausible, not worth the means.  
Weigh for a moment, classical desert  
Against a heart depraved and temper hurt;  
Hurt too perhaps for life; for early wrong  
Done to the nobler part affects it long;  
And you are staunch indeed in learning's cause  
If you can crown a discipline, that draws  
Such mischief after it, with much applause."

Byron, too, in his *Thoughts on a College Examination*, sees defects in the system, and concludes the poem thus:

"This much at least I may presume to say,  
The premium can't exceed the price they pay."

Maria Edgeworth had written,

"Superior knowledge is dearly acquired at the price of a malevolent disposition."

Young, in earlier times, and Ruskin, in more recent, have made statements that were a criticism of the English system.

Among the many things for which Horace Mann, the Apostle of the American Public School system, stood, was that of antagonism to the system under consideration. In the lecture given in the first year of his secretaryship of the Massachusetts Board of Education, he says, speaking of emulation: "I entreat all intelligent men to give to this subject a most careful consideration. And let those who use it as a quickener of the intellect, beware, lest it prove a depraver of the social

affections. \* \* \* \* \* No cruelty to a child can be so great as that which barter morals for attainments." \* \* \*  
"Will there ever be any less of this deadly strife for the ostensible signs of precedence, in the social and political arena, while the germs of emulation are so assiduously cultivated in the school-room, the academy and the college? The pale ambition of men ready to sacrifice country and kind for self, is only the fire of youthful emulation heated to a white heat."

We do not wonder that this ardent lover of young people, when he took charge of Antioch College, forbade the presence of the system in connection with the institution, an institution which under Mann's presidency became the pioneer of six or seven advance educational movements.

Through her journal, we are able to see how another American educator of international repute looked upon the system. Maria Mitchell, Vassar's brilliant astronomer, wrote: "I start for faculty and we probably shall elect what are called the 'honor girls.' I dread the struggle that is pretty certain to come. The whole system is demoralizing and foolish. Girls study for prizes and not for learning, when 'honors' are at the end. The unscholarly motive is wearing. If they studied for sound learning the cheer which would come with every day's gain would be health preserving."

A present Vassar Professor, Lucy M. Salmon, contends for the same principle, asserting, "The practice of giving honors is demoralizing, and, if it could be eradicated from the educational system, a long step in advance would be taken."

In one of the Great Universities of the west, that of Indiana, the system is under the ban. We quote from the Vice President of this University: "I rather incline to believe with those who think that everything in the school which excites emulation, everything in the way of prizes and honors, all that sort of thing, from the bottom to the top, does more harm than good. Of course if Colonel Parker were here he would say the same thing in his great emphatic way. I am not sure of it, but it is true as far as my experience goes. In our university, for instance, we give no honors, we give no grades, we give nothing at all but 'pass' and 'not pass.' That does not re-

sult in the hundreds of students who are there doing just enough to pass. They did not come there for that. *Their attention is turned away from the artificial effort for marks, to the work they are there to do.*"

Let us hear how Colonel Parker says the same things "in his emphatic way." "Bad as corporal punishment has been and is, the substitution of a system of rewards is infinitely worse. Fear of punishment is bad enough, but the systematic development of selfishness is damnable." Again he asserts, "No prayer-meeting, no religion on earth can eradicate this monstrous tendency of selfishness which parents and teachers are ignorantly and prayerfully fostering."

Dr. Search in his article on the "Ethics of the Public School" writes thus: "I have been thirty-five years in the schoolroom as teacher and pupil; have lived a good part of that time (with regret be it said) in the atmosphere of prizes and percents; have watched their false spur and unnatural coloring of character; have looked upon noble ambition perverted to things abnormal; have seen the physical, intellectual and moral wreckage that ensued; and as a result of personal observation and personal experience, I do not hesitate to pronounce the whole system of incentives to which reference has been made, as abnormal, unprofitable, false, and immoral. Their entire tendency is to temporary result, to stifled interest, to the recognition of an unnatural means as an end, to the development of a selfish spirit and to dishonest practice, as well as to overpressure and overnervous and physical strain."

How long must this system be endured? Is there a possibility of relief from it and its effects? There is, we believe; because we believe that there is that in human nature that will in the end lead to a response to an appeal to the higher nature, if at the proper time such appeal be made silent. The task may be more difficult, may demand the services of educational artists rather than of artisans, but it is possible of achievement. We believe that relief is more than possible, that it is probable. There are signs of promise in the bold declarations we have quoted, in the attitude of some persons prominent in educational circles. These signs of promise are not more encourag-

ing to those who hope for better things than is the response that is oftentimes given by parents, to the expression of the larger hope.

But in the meantime the homes can become a counteracting factor, if they feel the need of so doing. Most homes at present are coöperating factors, however, and very intensely so at times. The home can very effectively guard the children against the dangers of the system, by cultivating a healthy lack of respect for such appeals, and by nourishing the natural motives that should prompt to effort. This rare bit of school-boy conversation fell upon our ears some years ago. One boy, speaking of some branch of study, said to his companion, "I have seven 'zipps' in that." The companion's reply was, "Heavens!" We regret that we did not look into the conditions that made this conversation possible. For the boy who so complacently possessed the "zipps" we have admiration. Such boys are safe, only awaiting the touch of the artist teacher. *Some such disregard for the system is at present the only safeguard.*

Very refreshing, indeed, is the dedicatory sentence of the book, "A Study of the Sky," by Dr. Herbert A. Howe, of the University of Denver:

TO HUNDREDS OF MY STUDENTS,  
whose steadfast devotion  
to their daily tasks  
is a delightful memory,  
this book is  
AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED.

## ARTICLE V.

## BABYLONIA, GLIMPSES OF ITS CIVILIZATION AND CULTURE.

BY PROFESSOR KARL JOSEF GRIMM, PH.D.

## I. THE COUNTRY, DECIPHERMENT AND EXCAVATION.

BABYLONIA is the territory enclosed by the lower Euphrates and Tigris, extending from the neighborhood of the modern city of Bagdad to the Persian gulf. It is about equal in area to the state of Louisiana, and largely made up of moorland and swampy districts. Owing to an extensive and careful system of canals and dykes the country became the most fertile land of the East and the granary of the ancient world. It was full of rich vegetation; the palm, the vine, and various fruits flourished in luxuriant abundance. Cities, towns, villages, hamlets covered the land. But today the country is a dreary depopulated desert where poverty and disease hold supreme sway. The sand swirls unhindered over the steppe and heaps up about huge and shapeless mounds of earth tells under which the ancient cities lie buried. Nothing is there to identify them as having ever been the abode of men.

No wonder that their very sites were mostly forgotten. When in the year 116 of our era the Emperor Trajan visited Babylon he found it in ruins. But a century before it had been the influential seat of a Parthian satrapy. This rapid decline was due, no doubt, partly to the decomposing influence of Romans and Parthians, partly to the increasing importance of the newly-founded cities of Seleucia, Ctesiphon, and Bagdad. Babylon served indeed as a regular quarry. Only sparse settlements of Jews and Christians breathed life into its ruins; and when, in the 10th or 11th century, the Arabic town of Hillah arose in the neighborhood of the ancient city, Babylon became completely deserted.

It is only within recent years that the treasures and splendors of the cities of Babylonia are again revealed to the sight



of man, and we are brought face to face with a civilization as marvelous as it is ancient.

The *decipherment* of the cuneiform inscriptions and the *excavations* and *exploration* of the old Babylonian and Assyrian cities form one of the most brilliant pages in the scientific annals of the nineteenth century and of our own time. As early as the 16th century travelers startled Europe with the news that magnificent ruins, covered in many places with mysterious signs, had been found near Persepolis in Persia. In 1621 the famous Italian, Pietro della Valle, acquainted the scholarly world with some of these signs which he had copied. But not until 1770 when Carsten Niebuhr, scholar and traveler, the father of the renowned historian of Rome, B. G. Niebuhr, brought more extensive and more accurate copies to Europe, was a basis furnished for future decipherment. Niebuhr confirmed the conjecture of Pietro della Valle that the inscriptions were to be read from left to right; he further observed the wedge-character of the signs and distinguished three different styles of writing, the first of which, having the fewest (42) characters, he rightly recognized as alphabetical. Toward the end of the 18th century Gerhard Tychsen, professor of Oriental languages in the university of Rostock, noticed that a peculiarly oblique wedge was constantly recurring at certain intervals, and ingeniously concluded that it must be a word-divider. Three years later (1802) the Danish scholar Friedrich Münter was able to affirm that the first system of writing was alphabetic, the second syllabic, and the third ideographic. Of course, he directed his efforts of decipherment toward the first system as being the simplest. He pointed out that, inasmuch as the inscriptions must have originated between the time of Cyrus and Alexander (558—330 B. C.), the language of the inscriptions could be sought only in the idiom of ancient Persia. He further showed that the same kind of signs, sometimes increased by one or more characters, occurred between the oblique word-divider and, therefore, must indicate the same words, with or without grammatical endings.

These beginnings finally led to the discovery of the real key to the mysterious writings. On the 4th of September, 1804,

George Friedrich Grotefend, a professor of Latin in the gymnasium at Göttingen, read before the Royal Academy of Sciences an essay in which he communicated his discoveries concerning the Persepolitan cuneiform inscriptions. With the true insight of a genius he saw that these inscriptions were not merely in three different styles of writing but in three different languages, and must have originated from the builders of the palaces where they were found, *i. e.*, from the Achemanian kings of Persia; further, that the most simple kind, since it always occupies the first place, must be the language of the ruling dynasty, Old Persian; and that the texts most likely contained the names of those rulers. By ingenious conjectures Grotefend reached the conclusion that only Hystaspes, Darius, and Xerxes could be the kings mentioned. Comparing, then, these names, known to him from the Bible and the Classics, with one another as to their length and the recurrence of certain sounds he came to the following result: One group of signs constantly recurring must contain the titles. Owing to the great severity of tradition in the East these must be identical with the titles found in inscriptions of the late Persian kings of the Sassanide dynasty (226—637 A. D.), and must therefore mean King, Great King, or King of Kings respectively. The signs preceding these groups must, then, be the proper names. If now the sounds of the Persian form for Darius assumed by Grotefend, namely *Darhensh*, were substituted for certain signs of the groups supposed to be proper names, a second name could be interpreted as *Kshharsha*, and the third be read as *Goshtarp*; the letters which the three names held in common would appear in each one at the proper place.

Thus a solid basis had been found for all cuneiform research. Through the efforts chiefly of the great orientalists Silvestre de Sacy, Rask, Burnouf, Lassen, A. Holtzmann, Henry Rawlinson, Hincks, Benfey, Oppert, and Spiegel the work now advanced steadily and methodically, with the result that in 1862 the decipherment of the Old Persian inscriptions was practically completed, the alphabet definitely settled, the grammar known. Today all the texts, about twenty in number, can be interpreted with absolute certainty. What a triumph for

science! Stimulated by such signal success scholars directed their attention to the second and third system of inscriptions. A happy thought guided investigators from the beginning, the thought namely, that we have here nothing but literal translation of the text of the first system. The Persian kings wanted their proclamations to be understood by all subjects of their wide empire; consequently they had their inscriptions written not alone in the imperial language of Persia, but also in other languages of the realm, just as the Emperor of Austria, for example, has his pronunciamientos printed in German, Slavic and Hungarian.

The second system, appearing simpler than the third, was first attacked. Soon it was seen that, owing to the great number of signs (111), alphabetic writing was out of the question, and Münter was right when he conjectured it to be syllabic. A beginning was made with the proper names, the position of which (and probable pronunciation) could be determined from the analogous position in the Old Persian column. The problem was successfully solved through the united efforts of such scholars as Westergaard, Hincks, De Saulcy, Norris, Mordtmann, Lenormant, Oppert, Hommel, and Weissbach. It is believed that we have here the language of Elam.

Grotefend had stated that the cuneiform inscriptions of the third column probably represent the speech of Babylonia. It goes without saying that this aroused the greatest interest of scholars, but for some time it seemed impossible ever to decipher them. The great number and variety of the characters baffled all human ingenuity. Even after it had been discovered that the Babylonian writing was syllabic and that the proper names were rendered recognisable by a perpendicular wedge, only little seemed to be gained. But here cuneiform research received help from unexpected quarters, from the excavations in Mesopotamia.

Opposite Mosul, in the Vilayet Bagdad of Asiatic Turkey, immense artificial mounds arrest the attention of the traveller. In 1765 Carsten Niebuhr visited the mounds and noticed masses of brickwork cropping out above the ground, immense fields of debris covering the mounds, bricks with traces of

strange characters found upon them, and many other objects lying on the surface. He was sure that he was standing upon the ruins of an ancient and mighty city, Nineveh. On account of time, however, Niebuhr was unable to undertake a thorough and systematic investigation. This was done by Claudius James Rich, resident of the British East India Company in Bagdad. After having visited and studied the ruins near Hillah he came, in 1820, to Mosul and, during a stay of four months, made similar investigations of the *tells* of Nineveh. He was rewarded by happy finds of brick covered with cuneiform inscriptions and other objects such as engraved gems, all of which, along with those from Hillah, he forwarded to the British Museum at London. "A box of three square foot included everything that was known of proud Babylon and great Nineveh." The newly found texts, it was discovered, in the same script as the third column, as yet undeciphered, of the trilingual Achemænian inscriptions. Soon afterward the latter were enriched by a most precious monument, the great Darius inscription carved on the face of the rocky cliff of Behistun, which rises abruptly from the plain about a mile northeast of Kermanshah, on the western frontier of Persia. The honor of this discovery belongs to Sir Henry Rawlinson, then a young English officer in the Persian army. The sculptures are placed at a dizzy height, reaching in their upper portion an elevation of about five hundred feet above the plain, and are so difficult of access that Messrs. Coste and Flandin, who were sent out by the French government with express instructions to copy the inscriptions, returned with their mission unaccomplished, declaring them to be absolutely inaccessible. But in spite of the fatigue, exposure, and personal danger involved, Rawlinson began his studies; undaunted by all obstacles he persevered, and on January 1st, 1828, he was able to communicate his discoveries to the Royal Asiatic Society of London.

Excavation followed now upon excavation in Mesopotamia. In 1842 the naturalist Paul Emile Botta was sent from France as consul to Mosul. Encouraged by the German scholar Julius von Mohl, at that time Professor of Persian in Paris and Secretary of the French Asiatic Society, to follow the example of

Rich, Botta began digging on the great mound Nebiyumis, but on account of opposition by the Mohamedans who worshipped there the grave of the prophet Jonah, he gave up excavation on this *tell* and turned to that of Kuyunjik. Not being successful, a short distance to the north, he removed, in 1843, at the suggestion of an Arab to Khorsabad, about four miles to the northeast. Here he laid bare an enormous palace, adorned with wonderful alabaster sculptures. The site proved to be the residence of Sargon II, the powerful conqueror of Samaria (722 B. C.). The movable objects found by Botta and his successor Victor Place, a noted French architect, were sent to Paris, where they constitute one of the chief treasures of the Louvre.

Two years later, in 1845, an English government official and traveler, Sir Austen Henry Layard, was enabled, through the munificence of Sir Stratford Canning, the English minister at Constantinople, to begin excavations near the modern village Nimrud, about fifteen miles south of Mosul. His labors were crowned with success. He unearthed three great Assyrian palaces, together with a large yield of sculptures, inscriptions, and miscellaneous objects. The site was discovered to be the city of Calah, and the palaces those of Ashurnasipal (886-860 B. C.), Shalmaneser II (859-825), and Esarhaddon (681-668). On the site of Nineveh he uncovered, at Kuyunjik, the palace of Sennacharib (705-681), and, at Nebijunus, three more royal residences. In the spring of 1852 he identified the mound at Kalah Shergat, forty miles south of Nimrud, as the site of Ashur, the earliest Assyrian capitol, and found there an octagonal prism of Tiglath Pileser I (1120). Hormuzd Rassam, Layard's assistant, discovered, in 1853, on the northern part of Kuyunjik, the palace of Ashurbanipal (668-626), the Sardana-pallus of the Greeks, and found there several rooms filled with fragments of small and large clay tablets closely inscribed on both sides in the cuneiform characters. These tablets turned out to be the remnants of the royal library. In the corners of the palaces cylinders were found which proved to be the foundation records containing more or less extended annals of the events that occurred during the reign of the

monarch whose official residence was thus brought to light. The larger part of the objects obtained by Layard and Rassam is deposited in the British Museum.

Since Rich published, in 1812, his valuable memoir on the ruins of Babylon, in the *Wiener Fundgruben des Morgenlandes*, the mounds of Southern Mesopotamia have been visited by travelers and explorers, among others by Sir Austen Henry Layard. From 1849 to 1854 Sir Henry Rawlinson, assisted by William K. Loftus and J. E. Taylor, conducted excavations at Warka, the sight of the ancient city of Erech; at Mugheir, the supposed site of Ur; at Abu Shahrein, identified with Eridu, the southernmost and one of the oldest cities of Babylonia; and at Birs Nimrud, about seven miles southwest of Hillah, where he opened what proved to be the famous seven-staged temple as described by Herodotus.

Within this same period (1852-1854) the French government sent out an expedition under the leadership of Fulgence Fresnel and J. Oppert, to explore the mounds that had hitherto not been touched, many not even identified. Much valuable work was accomplished, especially in the study of the series of extensive *tells* (the most prominent are Babil, El-Kasr, and Tell-Amranibu-Ali) covering the remains of ancient Babylon. Unfortunately the antiquities recovered by the French explorers were lost through the sinking of the raft as they carried their burden down the Tigris.

With the year 1854 the excavations halted for two decades. The demand was not for the search of new things, but for the study of the vast mass of material that had been accumulated. Would it not now be possible to penetrate the secret of the language? With extraordinary zeal scholars applied themselves to the arduous task and, by dint of the most painstaking labor, succeeded. The credit for the solution of the riddle is due to the united efforts of Kidor Löwenstern, a Swede, the Frenchman, de Saulcy, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks, of Dublin, and the academician, J. Oppert. From small beginnings, starting with the proper names, they advanced methodically step by step until they had established the polyphonic and syllabic character of the writing and the Semitic character

of the language. In December 1851 Rawlinson has so far progressed in his work that he could publish his epoch making *Memoir on the Babylonian and Assyrian Inscriptions* which contained the cuneiform text, transliteration, and translation of the whole of the Babylonian portion of the Behistun inscription, together with a commentary and analysis of the first thirty-seven lines, and a list of 246 characters whose phonetic (in some cases ideographic) values he has for the most part correctly determined. The mass of inscriptions found in Mesopotamia helped to substantiate, correct, and further the labor of Rawlinson, so that the Assyrian and Babylonian documents were read with ever increasing ease and accuracy.

The general public, however, received the results of cuneiform research with considerable reserve; the polyphony of the characters especially taxed their credulity. If, it was said, the Assyria characters possess multiple values, how can we be sure that the Assyriologists, working independently of each other on the same text, will assign to the characters the same values, and thus extract the same meaning? the Assyriologists did not shrink from the test. In 1857 Mr. W. H. Talbot, not only one of the inventors of photography, but also a pioneer of cuneiform research, wrote to the Asiatic Society enclosing a sealed translation of the long inscription of Tiglath Pileser, discovered in the ruins of Kalah Shergat, the text of which was at that time in process of publication by the trustees of the British Museum, and suggested that copies of the text be furnished to a number of Assyriologists, who should make independent translations, and submit them to the society. The suggestion was adopted; Rawlinson, Hincks, Oppert undertook the work; in a month's time the translations were completed and handed in, sealed, to a special committee appointed for their examination. The result was a complete triumph for the Assyriologists. The translations were in remarkable accord; differing here and there in the matter of a shade of meaning, of a word, or even of a whole phrase; but no unprejudiced observer could fail to see that all four were translations of one and the same text. Assyriology had established its claims; henceforward there could be no doubt as to the soundness of the principles laid down by



its expositors, or the methods they employed. The investigation advanced now with rapid strides, especially since the French government and the British Museum supplied scholars with the material by publishing the treasures found in the East, and, in 1869, Professor Eberhard Schrader proved in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, scientifically, beyond a reasonable doubt, the solidity of the new science of Assyriology. Since then a whole galaxy of enthusiastic scholars, American, English, French, German, and Italian have made its development their life-work, so that today the annals of Tiglath Pileser and Nebuchadnezzar, for instance, are just as well understood as Herodotus and Livy.

Among the clay tablets obtained by Rassam from the library of Ashurbanipal George Smith, an engraver employed in the British Museum to make copper plates for the cuneiform texts, found, in 1872, fragments of a Babylonian story of the Deluge. He communicated his find to the Society for Biblical Archaeology. His translation, which showed a remarkable similarity with the Biblical account, aroused such immense interest that the proprietors of the "Daily Telegraph" offered to Smith the funds necessary for a renewal of the excavations, in the hope of finding the missing fragments. The young scholar accepted, and continued his task for three years (1873-1876). He died on his return from Nineveh, at Aleppo, a martyr to his self-sacrificing devotion. He had obtained a great number of tablets from the library of Ashurbanipal, including some more fragments of the account of the Deluge, and had also purchased for the British Museum valuable tablets from Babylonia. Hormuzd Rassam succeeded him (1877-1882). Among his many brilliant finds, that of the unique and important bronze doors of the temple of Shalmaneser II (859-829), found at Balawat, fifteen miles southeast of Mosul, deserves special mention. On Babylonian soil he excavated, in 1881, the famous temple of the sungod at Sippar, (Abbu Habba), together with the temple archives, some fifty thousand tablets recording gifts and the like to the temple.

About the same time (1875-1880) Ernest de Sarzec, French vice-consul at Bassorah, made a series of most important dis-



coveries. He found at Telloh the ancient city of Shirpula. In spite of various unfavorable circumstances he succeeded in gathering a whole collection of materials illustrative of the most ancient times; statues, stelae, bas-reliefs, vases of silver, of bronze, and of stone, and as many as thirty thousand tablets. Almost all the objects found bear inscriptions in the oldest cuneiform writing known to us, dating back to the fourth millennium B. C. Kings hitherto unknown, among them, as the most prominent, Gudea, of whom eight, unfortunately headless, statues were found, and a world of art unsuspected for these early ages have thus been revealed to us. These treasures are now among the most precious of the Louvre.

A great surprise came to scholars and explorers from the soil of Egypt. In the winter of 1887-88 some natives found at Telel-Amarna in Upper Egypt, about 180 miles south of Cairo by river, between three and four hundred tablets, which proved to consist of letters and dispatches in the Babylonian language addressed to the Egyptian courts in the 15th century B. C. Of these tablets eighty-two were secured for the British Museum, and one hundred and sixty for that of Berlin; the Bulag Museum has sixty; St. Petersburg and Paris a few, and the rest are in the hands of private individuals. These letters and dispatches throw in many respects a flood of light upon the history and conditions of Western Asia and Egypt, and furthermore show that as early as 1500 B. C., Babylonia was, just as French is today, the language of diplomacy, in which even Egyptian officials corresponded with their own king.

So far the excavations and explorations in Mesopotamia had been carried on by England and France. Now Germany and America entered into the arena and at once took a leading position. When, in 1886, the Royal Prussian Museums desired to send an expedition to Babylonia for the purpose of finding scientific treasures, the Kommerzienrat L. Simon, of Berlin, declared himself ready to defray the necessary expenses. The expedition, under the leadership of the scholars Moritz and Koldewey, excavated for nine months at Surgul and El-Hibba. The two mounds were found to have been burial places for human corpses. Greater results awaited the explorations

carried on, under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, by Rev. John P. Peters, Mr. John H. Haynes, and Prof. Hilprecht. At Nuffar, the site of old Nippur, a centre of early Babylonia religious life, the American archaeologists uncovered the great temple of Bel, the foundations of which go back to a still earlier period than the ruins of Telloh. Beginning with 1888 each successive year of their activity has brought to light new architectural and artistic features such as, for instance, the ancient city gates, streets similar to those of Pompeii, the remains of stores and shops, and a fairly well preserved kitchen; numberless smaller objects, *e. g.*, specimens of pottery, jars, bowls, cones, images, as well as gold, alabaster and copper work; an ever increasing number of historical, legal, and religious records, to be counted by the thousands and partly antedating those of Gudea. This rich and splendid booty is deposited in the University Museum which has thus become one of the grandest collections of the world. America can justly be proud of the achievement of its scholars and explorers.

In 1898 the enthusiasm and zeal of Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, son of the great Lutheran theologian Franz Delitzsch, brought it about that a German Orient Society was formed for the purpose of sending out expeditions to the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, and first of all to Babylon. Scarcely a year after its foundation the Society was ready, thanks to the splendid munificence of His Majesty, the German Emperor, to send out an expedition under the direction of Dr. Robert Koldewey, of Görtlich, assisted by the Assyriologist, Dr. Meissner, of Halle, and 'Regierungsbauführer' Andrae. They started their thorough and systematic explorations on March 26th, 1899, and their labor has since been crowned with signal success. Among the most interesting finds may be mentioned a stele bearing in front the image of the Hittite storm-god, and on the back a Hittite inscription. At Karr, one of the mounds under which Babylon lies buried, they have laid bare the famous *Street of Processions* mentioned in the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar II (604-561), which ran along the outside of the King's palace, leading from Borsippa across the Euphrates to Babylon. On the Babylonian New Year's Day Nabu (Nebo),

the god of writing and patron of agriculture and science, was carried along this broad and handsomely paved street, in a magnificent ship, to pay a visit to his father, Marduk (Merodach), the chief of the Babylonian pantheon, the type of the sun and the symbol of spring. The German archaeologists have also identified the famous temple of Marduk, and the great wall of Babylon; and what is perhaps still more admirable, they have reconstructed, from hundreds of fragments of glazed tiles, one of the lions which adorned the walls of Nebuchadnezzar's palace.

Within most recent years, in the winter of 1901-1902, the French expedition excavating at Susa under the direction of J. de Morgan found the oldest corpus juris in existence, the Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon (2250 B. C.). Soon afterwards it was published by the Assyriologist of the expedition, Father Scheil, and within a very short time was translated into French, German, and English.

Cities, temples, palaces that had been buried for thousands of years have been unearthed; immense quantities of objects of all kinds have been found; over a hundred thousand cuneiform inscriptions have been housed in the museums of Europe and America. What have these cities, temples, palaces, these objects and inscriptions to tell us concerning the *life* of the people of Babylonia, its *civilization and culture* as reflected in its *religion and morality, its social, political, economic and legal status, its science, literature and art?*

## II. PHASES OF THE RELIGION OF THE BABYLONIAN PEOPLE.

It may be impossible to write, in the present state of our knowledge, a historical and systematic exposition of the religion of the Babylonian people, but one thing can be established: *The whole life of the Babylonians was imbued with religion, which constituted the very source of their civilization and culture.*

The religion of the Babylonian people is polytheistic nature-worship, more especially star worship. Life is ascribed to the phenomena of nature, such as trees, plants, stones; to the occurrences in nature such as storms, rain, lightning, thunder; and to the great luminaries, the sun, the moon, the stars. The

Babylonian sees in the processes of nature not the working of mechanical law, but the direct action of a superior power. And as there is a variety of natural phenomena so there is a variety of divinities. Spirits are, indeed, lurking everywhere. Within recent years the question as to a possible tendency towards monotheism, or even complete monotheism, has been under repeated discussion. So far as I can judge it has not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that monotheism was entertained by the Babylonians. The idea that the various divinities are really one great deity may be interpreted in the sense of naturalistic pantheism; and, moreover, it would be confined to the thinkers and theologians. The religion of the *people* was, undoubtedly, polydemonistic and polytheistic.

Adoration is directed especially to heaven, to the earth, and the subterranean waters; to the sun, the moon, Venus, the planets in general, and the atmospheric forces. Each divinity could be worshipped under different aspects: the god Raman, for instance, is addressed as the giver of rain and as the thunderer. It is difficult to find system in the Babylonian pantheon; *prima facie* it appears rather as an agglomeration of divinities. Each Babylonian city, large or small, had a special deity devoted to its welfare, the spirit of the soil presiding over the territory. In some instances this might be a heavenly body, the sun, moon, a star, or it might be some atmospheric force, such as the rain, the storm, all of which were supposed to regulate or influence the fate of man. The deity which acted as guardian of the city was for that city the *deus supremus*. But this did not exclude the worship of other gods, nor the divinities of other cities. There was no intolerance: the conquered city accepted the gods of the conqueror. Moreover, any god that happens to be invoked is endowed with attributes which seem to raise him above all other gods. In the hymn addressed to the moongod (see below p. 6) *Sin* is called lord, begetter of everything, whose fullness is not reached by any god; who alone is exalted, without any equal among the gods, his brothers.

As in other polytheistic religions so also in the Babylonian

the individual gods are variously related to one another, as husband and wife—every god seems to have his consort or consorts—as father and son, as parents and children. But the generalogical relations fluctuate. Only in the case of two gods, *Ea*, the god of unfathomable wisdom, and *Marduk* (Merodach), the god of Babylon, we find that, whenever they are mentioned, the parental or filial relationship is emphasized. From the great number of gods we shall mention, first, the great triad *Anu*, *Bel*, and *Ea*.

*Anu* is the god of the heavenly expanse. Originally he was the city god of 'Der.' He hears prayers, but is not directly approached. The gods are his messengers who report to him what is going on in the world. His consort is *Anatum*.

*Bel* is worshipped as the god of the earth, the creator and champion of mankind. The principal seat of Bel-worship was Nippur. Bel's consort is *Belit*.

*Ea* is described as the god of the waters of the deep. He is the source of wisdom and culture. His principal sanctuary was at Eridu, one of the most ancient of the holy cities, situated near the shore of the Persian gulf.

A second triad is formed by *Sin*, *Shamash* and *Raman*.

*Sin*, or, as he is also called, *Nannar*, is the moon-god, and was especially worshipped at Ur and Haran.

*Shamash* represents the sun. He is called guide of the gods and judge of men. His main sanctuary was at Sippar.

*Raman*, the god of the atmosphere, the thunderer; the god of the rain, enjoyed special veneration at Hadad in Syria.

A third triad is constituted by *Ea*, *Marduk* and *Nabu*.

*Marduk* (Merodach) is the great local god of Babylon. He is the most important god of the Babylonian pantheon. The kings of Babylonia rule by the grace of Marduk. To him they pay special homage. Originally a solar deity, Marduk is essentially a life-giving god. He produces the life of nature. It was Marduk who conquered chaos and changed it into a cosmos. He is the author of order in the universe; he furthers and protects civilization; supports the weak, heals the sick, releases the prisoners. He is the counsellor who guides even the gods

in their decrees. He acts as mediator between his father Ea and mankind.

*Nabu* (Nébo), the son of Marduk, furnishes man with understanding and knowledge. He has revealed the art of writing; all literature is under his protection. He is called the scribe of the universe. Borsippa is his city.

Among the goddesses, *Ishtar* (*Ashtarte*) holds the preëminent place. She represents the planet Venus, the morning and evening star. As evening star she is the goddess of love and reproduction, the mother of mankind, the personification of fertility. She is further addressed as the mother of gods. In course of time she became simply *the* goddess. *Ishtar* is also worshipped as Queen of Battle.

Besides these deities there are a great many subordinate gods and goddesses, too numerous to mention here, that influence and control man's life.

The gods are all-powerful and supreme. All that happens is determined by them. Man owes his existence to them, and they interest themselves in his fate. Every man stands under the care of a special god, or a pair of divinities, his guardian angels as it were. In the character of the gods the nobler traces are not wanting. They see to it that righteousness and justice rule upon the earth; they are said to hate and punish wrong and violence; they may show mercy to those who call upon them in their afflictions, their faithful worshipper they overshadow with favors. Nowhere do we obtain a clearer view of the conceptions the Babylonians entertained in regard to their gods than we get from the *hymns* addressed to the various divinities. One of the hymns to the moon god is, especially, characteristic. It reads as follows:

O Lord, chief of the Gods, who on earth and in heaven alone is exalted!  
 Father Nannar, lord of increase, chief of the gods,  
 Father Nannar, heavenly lord, chief of the gods,  
 Father Nannar, moon-god, chief of the gods,  
 Father Nannar, lord of Ur, chief of the gods.  
 Father Nannar, lord of Eshirgal (a temple), chief of the gods,  
 Father Nannar, lord of the brilliant crescent, chief of the gods,  
 Father Nannar, perfect in sovereignty, chief of the gods.  
 Father Nannar, who passest along in great majesty,

O strong bull, great of horns, of perfect form, with long flowing beard of the color of lapis lazuli,

Powerful one, self-created, fair to look upon, whose fulness is self-created, Merciful one, begetter of everything, who occupies a lofty seat among living things,

Merciful Father and restorer, who maintainest the life of the whole world,

Lord, thy divinity, like the distant heaven and the wide ocean, is full (?) of awe,

Ruler of the land, protector of sanctuaries, proclaimer of their names,

Father, begetter of gods and of men, who establishest dwellings and grantest gifts,

Who callest to sovereignty, givest the sceptre, decreest destinies for distant days,

Strong chief whose wide heart embraces in mercy all that exists,

\* \* \* beautiful, whose knees do not grow weary, who opens the road (?) for the gods, his brothers,

\* \* \* who from the foundation of heaven to the zenith,

Passes along in brilliancy (?) opening the door of heaven,

Preparing the fate (?) of humanity,

Father, begetter of everything \* \* \* \* \*

Lord, proclaiming the decisions of heaven and earth,

Whose command is not set aside,

\* \* \* and granting water for all that has life.

No god reaches to thy fullness,

In heaven who is exalted? Thou alone art exalted.

On earth who is exalted? Thou alone art exalted.

Thy strong command is proclaimed in heaven, and the Igigi (spirits of heaven) prostrate themselves;

Thy strong command is proclaimed on earth, and the Anunaki (spirits of earth) kiss the ground,

Thy strong command on high, like a storm in the darkness, passes along, and nourishment streams forth,

When thy strong command is established on the earth, vegetation sprouts forth,

Thy strong command stretches over meadows and heights, and life is increased.

Thy strong command produces right and proclaims justice to mankind.

Thy strong command, through the distant heavens and the wide earth, extends to whatever there is,

Thy strong command, who can grasp it? Who can rival it?

Lord, in heaven is [thy] sovereignty, on earth is thy sovereignty,

Among the gods, thy brothers, there is none like thee,

O King of Kings, who has no judge superior to him, whose divinity is not surpassed by any other!

Marduk is addressed as the god of life:

O merciful one among the gods!

O merciful one who loveth to give life to the dead !  
 Marduk, King of heaven and of earth,  
 King of Babylon, lord of Esagila (temple in Babylon),  
 King of Ezida (temple at Borsippa), lord of Emath-tila (shrine of Borsippa),

Heaven and earth are thine.  
 The whole of heaven and earth is thine.  
 The spell that giveth life is thine,  
 The breath of life is thine,  
 The pure incantation of the ocean is thine,  
 Mankind, the black-headed race,  
 The living creatures, as many as there are, and exist on earth,  
 As many as there are in the four quarters,  
 The Igigi of the legions of heaven and earth,  
 As many as there are, to thee do they incline (?),  
 Thou art the *shedû*, thou art the *lamassu*  
 Thou restorest the dead to life, thou bringest things to completion (?),  
 O merciful one amongst the gods !

The gods, however, are neither omnipresent nor omniscient, as may be seen from the following hymn :

Bell who saw the oppression in heaven of the hero Sin,  
 The lord said to his messenger, god Nusku :  
 "My servant Nusku, carry my command to the Ocean,  
 "The news concerning my son Sin, who is sorely oppressed in heaven,  
 "Inform Ea in the ocean,"  
 Nusku honored the command of his master  
 To Ea in the deep he swiftly went,  
 To the high *massu*, the exalted, the lord *Nukimmat*,  
 Nusku brought the word of his master to the other side.  
 Ea in the ocean heard the word, and bit his lip,  
 And with woe his mouth was filled.  
 Ea called his son Marduk and commanded him :  
 Go, my son Marduk,  
 Of the son of the noble luminary (Nannar) who in heaven is sorely oppressed,  
 His oppression in heaven has been manifested ;  
 Those seven evil gods, murderers, — irreverential they are,  
 They invade the land,  
 Into the land they come like clouds,  
 Before Sin angrily \* \* \* \* \*  
 The hero Shamash, Raman, the warlike, they brought into their power !

Ethical defects such as drunkenness, deceit, cunning, immorality are, sometimes, attributed to the gods. In the Babylonian account of the creation we read, for instance, of the followers



of the god *Anshar* that, after war had been declared against the powers of chaos, they assembled at a meal:

They ate bread, they drank wine.  
The sweet wine took away their senses.  
They became drunk, and their bodies swelled up.

In order to obtain the favor of the gods man must fear and worship them and obey their commands. Sacrifice and prayer are, likewise, enjoined. It is said that

Fear of God begets mercy,  
Sacrifice prolongs life,  
And prayer dissolves sin.

Prayer is always a request of some kind, mostly for some physical good. Prayer as the result of an irresistible longing to hold communion with God we do not find among the many prayers and invocations that have come down to us. The various hymns, even the most beautiful ones among them, show traces of their having been, originally, formulas of incantation by which the god was to be forced to accede to the request of the petitioner. Let us take, for example, a passage from a hymn to *Shamash*:

The law of mankind thou dost direct,  
Eternally just in the heavens thou art,  
Of faithful judgment toward all the world thou art,  
Thou knowest what is right, thou knowest what is wrong,  
O *Shamash*, the support of *Anu* and *Bel* thou art,  
O *Shamash*, supreme judge of heaven and earth thou art,  
O *Shamash*, supreme judge, great lord of all the world thou art,  
Lord of creation, merciful one of the world thou art,  
O *Shamash*, on this day, purify and cleanse the king, the son of his god,  
Whatever is evil within him, let it be taken out.  
Cleanse him like a vessel \* \* \* \* \*  
Illumine him like a vessel of \* \* \* \* \*  
Like the copper of a polished tablet let him be bright,  
Release him from the ban.

Similarly the hymns to *Marduk*, likewise excelling in pious feeling and splendid diction, usually end with an incantation.

Expel the disease of the sick man,  
The plague, the wasting disease \* \* \*

A prayer to the fire-god *Gibil* reads as follows:

O Gibil, mighty one, that art exalted in the land !  
 Leader in command, child of the ocean, who art exalted in the land !  
 Gibil ! with thy bright fire thou makest light in the house of darkness ;  
 Thou determinest everything that exists ;  
 Of copper and tin thou art the mixer ;  
 Of silver and gold thou art the purifier ;  
 Of the deity Ninkasi thou art associate ;  
 Thou art he who changest in the night the mind of the evil one.  
 May the physical strength of the pious man become vigorous again !  
 May he be brilliant like the heaven,  
 May he be bright like the earth !  
 May he shine like the centre of heaven !

The Babylonian inscriptions recording the erection of statues, the building or restoration of palaces and temples usually contain a prayer of the royal patron and architect. The objects asked for are, as a rule, success in war, abundance at home, long life, a secure throne, and numerous offspring.

Thus the Old Babylonian king Gudea (3100 B. C.) upon completing a statue to his god *Ningirsu* prays, Ningirsu, grant to Gudea who has built this house a good fate.

Tiglath Pileser (1120-1100 B. C.) after restoring the temple of Anu and Raman beseeches these gods that they may be pleased to hear his petitions, may send abundant rains and years of plenty, may preserve him in battle, may subject to him all hostile lands and kings, may graciously draw near to him and establish his priesthood.

Ashurbanipal (668-626 B. C.) begs of the sun-god to consider favorably his deeds, grant him long life, good health and joy, and also to bless his brother, the king of Babylon.

From Nebuchadnezzar (605-562) we have a great many prayers. Upon completing the restoration of a temple to Ninkarrak at Sippar he addresses the goddess as follows: "*Ninkarrak, lofty goddess, look with favor upon the work of my hands. Mercy towards me be the command of thy lips. Long life, abundance of strength, health and joy grant to me as a gift.*" After he had restored the great temple of Shamash at Sippar he prays: "*O Shamash, great lord, upon entering joyfully into the glorious temple Ebabarra, look with favor upon my precious work. Mercy toward me be thy command. Through thy right-*

*cous order may I have abundance of strength. Long life and a firm throne grant to me. May my rule last forever! With a righteous sceptre of blissful rulership, with a legitimate staff, bringing salvation to mankind adorn my rule forever! With strong weapons for the battle protect my soldiers! O Shamash, answer me correctly by oracle and dream! By thy supreme command, which is unchangeable, may my weapons advance, strike, and overthrow the weapons of my enemies"* Elsewhere he asks for old age, numerous offspring, tribute from all the kings of the world, a secure throne, long reign, and that the threshold, the bars, the bolt, the doors of the temple which he has restored may be to the god perpetual reminders of the piety of the king.

Upon his ascendance to the throne Nebuchadnezzar approaches Marduk with a prayer.

O Eternal Ruler! Lord of all being!  
Grant that the king whom thou lovest,  
Whom thou hast called to the throne according to thy great pleasure,  
May flourish before thee!  
Guide him in a straight path,  
I am the ruler, obedient to thee, the creature of thy hand;  
'Tis thou who hast created me, and  
With dominion over mankind hast entrusted me.  
According to thy mercy, O Lord,  
Which thou dost bestow upon all mankind,  
Cause me to love thy supreme dominion,  
Implant in my heart the fear of thy god-head.  
Grant to me whatever is pleasing to thee,  
For it is thou that hast fashioned my life.

The following is a prayer of Nabonidus (555-538 B. C.), the last king of Babylon, addressed to the moon god:

"O Sin, lord of the gods, king of the gods of heaven and of the earth, great god of gods, inhabitant of the great heavens, when into this temple thou enterest in joy, may grace unto Ešagilla, Erida and Egishshurkal, temples of thy great divinity, be established by thy command. And the fear of thy great divinity establish in the hearts of thy people, that they may not commit sin against thy great divinity. May their foundations be firm like the heavens! As for me, Nabonidus, king of Babylon, in the goodness of thy great divinity rescue me, and life unto

*distant days grant to me as a gift. And as for Belshazzar, my chief son, offspring of my loins, establish in his heart the fear of thy divinity in order that he may not commit sin."*

We find in the Babylonian religious literature expressions of a deep feeling for sin and guilt. Indeed the noblest documents of Babylonian religion are the so-called *penitential psalms* which are traced back to the second half of the third millennium before Christ. In these penitential psalms we have genuine *documents humains*: the soul of man crying for deliverance, forgiveness, and redemption.

By sin the Babylonians meant "a missing of the mark," a failure to comply with the demands of the god under whose protection one stood. The evil act is judged not so much as being an expression of character, or as affecting human beings, but rather as an offense against unseen powers. There is no distinction between moral and ceremonial delinquency, nor between delinquency and error. In the penitential psalms the confession of sin sometimes concerns only the omission of ceremonial acts required by the divinity. Mostly, however, moral faults, such as discord among members of a family, cruelty, oppression, dishonesty, mendacity, lack of reverence towards gods and parents, are referred to. It is not necessary that a sin be knowingly committed. The penitent feels the weight of offences into which he has unwittingly fallen:

The sin that I have committed I know not,  
An offense I have committed unwittingly against my God,  
A sin against my goddess I have been guilty of unwittingly,  
O Lord, my sins are many, great are my transgressions,  
O my god, my sins are many, great are my transgressions,  
O my goddess, my sins are many, great are my transgressions,  
Known (or unknown) god, my sins are many, great are my transgressions.

In another psalm we read:

O my god, my transgression is great, many are my sins,  
O my god, my transgression is great, many are my sins,  
O my goddess, my transgression is great, many are my sins,  
O my god, thou knowest what I did not know,  
My transgression is great, many are my sins;  
O my goddess, thou knowest what I did not know,  
My transgression is great, many are my sins,  
The transgression I committed I did not know,

The sin that I sinned I did not know.  
 The forbidden food I ate,  
 On the forbidden thing I trod,  
 My god in the wrath of his heart has punished me,  
 God in the strength of his heart has overwhelmed me.  
 The goddess smote me with misfortune, and caused me pain,  
 The god who knew what I did not know caused darkness.  
 I lay on the ground, and none took hold of my hand,  
 I wept, and none grasped my hands,  
 I cried aloud—there was none that heard me,  
 I was amidst gloom and grief, I did not arise myself,  
 Upon God I cast my misfortune; my prayer I directed \* \* \* \*  
 How long, O my god \* \* \* \*  
 The sin I committed turn into blessing,  
 The transgression I committed, may the wind carry it off.  
 My manifold sorrows, destroy like a garment.  
 O my god, seven times seven are my transgressions.

Man must be constantly on his guard for fear he may offend  
 some god or goddess and call down upon him divine wrath  
 and punishment. The punishment for sin consists in sorrow,  
 sickness, misfortunes of all kinds and death.

A goddess has become angry with me, and brought me into pain.  
 A known (or unknown) god has oppressed me,  
 A known (or unknown) goddess has brought sorrow upon me.

As a consequence man lived in constant fear. No matter  
 how near the gods were felt to be, one could never be sure of  
 their good-will.

Thrown upon the mercy of the angry deity, it mattered little  
 what had called forth this wrath; the thought that would en-  
 gage the entire attention of the penitent was the appeasement  
 of his god; to obtain deliverance, not so much from sin itself,  
 as from the punishment inflicted. In order to effect a recon-  
 ciliation a mediator is needed. According to Babylonian ideas  
 it seems, a god could not be approached by the common man  
 directly, but only through chosen messengers, the *priests*. This  
 idea of mediation is so pronounced as to lead to the frequent  
 association with a god of a second divinity, his son or his ser-  
 vant, through whom the petition of man is brought to the  
 throne of mercy. The priest acts as the representative of god  
 upon earth.

## A PENITENTIAL PSALM.

- The penitent* : I, thy servant, beseech thee, O give me peace !  
 Accept the fervent prayer of the sinner,  
 If thou inclinest thy heart to a man—that man liveth.  
 O goddess, ruler over all, lady of mankind,  
 Merciful one to whom it is good to turn, who hearest prayer.
- The priest* : Behold, his god and his goddess being angry with him, he  
 calls upon thee,  
 Turn thy face to him and take him by the hand !
- The penitent* : There is no god above thee, none ruling over thee.  
 Graciously have mercy upon me, receive my supplication!  
 When, at last, (will there be rest) ? oh, may thy wrath be  
 calmed !  
 How long, O my goddess, till thy countenance be turned  
 towards me !  
 I moan like doves, I satiate myself with sighs.
- The priest* : With pain and ache, his soul is full of sighs  
 Tears he weeps, he pours forth lament (?).

Whilst the penitential psalms thus exhibit a deep feeling of sin and guilt, other monuments of Babylonian literature abound in expressions of selfrighteousness. The kings especially never fail to tell in their annals what excellent rulers they are, and how good the relations between the gods and themselves. Sometimes we read whole columns of introductory selflaudation. Hammurabi (2250 B. C.) calls himself the exalted prince, the worshipper of the gods, the wise king, who restored Eridus to its place, who purified the sanctuary of E-apsu ; who made the fame of Babylon great ; who rejoiced the heart of Marduk, his lord ; the pious and suppliant one ; the divine protector of the land, etc. Ashurbanipal appeals to Ishtar on the ground of what he has done to promote the glory of the goddess in his land. He devoted himself to her service, he observed the festivals in her honor and repaired her shrine. In return for all this Ishtar is to become gracious to him and cut off his affliction.

In this connection it may be mentioned that the kings always refer their great deeds to the help of the gods. Even the hunting expeditions of the Assyrian kings, if successful, are so through divine assistance. Ashurbanipal writes : *I, Ashurbanipal, King of the Universe, King of Assyria, in the power of my greatness seized a right wild lion by the tail, by the command of Ninib and Nergal, the gods, my helpers, with the weapon of my hand I smashed his skull.*

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

## ARTICLE VI.

THE LANGUAGE QUESTION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH  
OF AMERICA.

BY REV. A. SPIECKERMANN.

We call with pride our dear Lutheran Church the Mother of the Reformation. It is with pleasure that we watch her mighty development. For if there is a denomination that has met the expectation of the people, it is the Church of the hero who at Wittenberg in 1517 nailed those 95 world renowned theses to the church door; it is the Church of the hero of faith who by his indomitable courage showed that even the greatest forces of darkness could not prevent him from setting forth the principles of truth, as he, by earnest and humble searching, had found them in Holy Writ. Martin Luther believed in biblical truths with all his heart, because Christian experience had taught him their reliability. Clinging to the Word of God has made the Lutheran Church the most powerful Protestant institution in the world. But her mighty onward strides have been checked in the land, where her cradle stood, by a theology which by its negative tendencies has lost its right to existence in the Church of the Word. We cannot at this time dwell on the destructive influence modern theology has exercised in Germany, but confining ourselves to our subject will now consider one of the problems confronting the Lutheran Church in America, a problem whose wrong solution will doubtless become harmful to her development. I mean the Language Question. It goes without saying that the prosperity of the Church will depend to a large degree, upon her attitude toward this question. If the glorious words of Theodore Roosevelt, "the Lutheran Church in America will be one of the two or three leading institutions of the future," shall be realized, then our dear Church must settle her language affairs in such a way that no future time will witness the sad fact that so many chil-

dren get lost to their Church, because the latter has neglected their ecclesiastical instruction in the official language of the country, which alone they understand. The difficult condition in which the Lutheran Church in America finds herself in regard to the Language Question must be explained by the immigration of the different peoples, particularly the German and Scandinavian. Some of these settlers made a mistake in not founding schools where they built their congregations.

But everyone knows that those parochial schools of the immigrants, erected here and there, have been the best means of maintaining the languages and the best thoughts and ideas of the old countries. One would think the old settlers would have paid attention to so important a matter. But alas, that was, as we already remarked, not everywhere the case. When thrown among English speaking-people they often forgot, only too soon, the sacred treasures and traditions of their fatherland by which they had achieved so much success and believe they could easiest reach the height of prosperity by adapting themselves as fast as possible to the circumstances by which they were surrounded. But you ask in astonishment, is that not the duty of everyone who has adopted this country as his own? I answer: Yes and no. Yes, insofar, as every good foreigner will respect the great and noble institutions of the American people and try sincerely to become as good a citizen as possible. But no, I say, when, for instance, the question arises, Shall the foreigner accept in a lump all the social and ecclesiastical teachings and habits of the new world. For here we have to consider that the American people is not yet one race, but a conglomeration of nationalities destined to grow into one great people, the one great American nation. But before this great goal is reached, every nation must be allowed to furnish its contribution to the welfare of this country in its own way. That each people is eager to make this country as great as possible, will not be questioned, but on the other hand it will not be denied that in these endeavours for the greatness of this Republic of ours the spirit of fanaticism often played an unpleasant part. I make, indeed, a fair statement, when I say that not only the



foreigner, but also the native allowed himself sometimes to be ruled by the spirit of intolerance. There were and there are natives who ridicule the language of the foreigner and make it appear as something of second order. I often wonder if these critics have so much historical knowledge as to know that the languages of the foreigners possess treasures of classical beauty, far superior to the literary products of this country? I wonder, if those critics are so ignorant as to believe that the language alone will make good and useful citizens of this country? I know the intelligent American never thinks so, for education has deprived him of such prejudices. When he goes to a foreign country, say Germany, he knows he will be given plenty of time to become acquainted with the institutions of that country, before anyone asks him to become naturalized. He knows further that the good thoughts and habits of his country will be appreciated everywhere, but that he would make himself suspicious, would he, for policy's sake, exchange them for worse ones. And is he not a hero who under the most difficult circumstances clings to his good old principles?

It is this noble consideration that makes it so hard for the Germans to part with their language. Knowing the great, distinguished teachings of their country, which, as recently one of the American college presidents said, have established for them the reputation of being the teachers of the world, we well understand their tenacious adherence to the language of their old country. And who will blame them for so doing? Look at the great treasures of philosophy, poetry, literature, music and moral and religious teachings of their language and then tell me, if this people of poets and thinkers, must not claim the respect of all who bear the German name; tell me, if this people must not expect from everyone who speaks its tongue, the spread of those great ideas which have made it so great and will doubtless benefit other nations? It is therefore the contents and not the form, the thought and not the language, that is of value to the welfare of a nation.

From this axiom we draw the logical conclusion that it will not harm the American nation to have in its fold beside the of-

ficial English tongue other languages. The beloved man in the presidential chair of the United States who speaks the German language fluently, can testify to the correctness of this statement. Besides, a host of sober social reformers will assure us that the process of Americanisation needs not to be accelerated in a nervous way, and that a quiet and lawful development will gradually bring the desired results.

The criticism we allowed ourselves as to some of the English-speaking people in this country applies with equal force to a good many foreigners. For they, too, are under the influence of a good many prejudices, when they come to the shores of America. We cannot blame them too much, for everything is new to them and many strange teachings call forth their suspicion. No wonder that Lutheran immigrants cling firmly to the old doctrines and principles of the fatherland which appeared to them like solid rock under their feet; no wonder they hold the banners of Lutheranism in this country higher than they did in the old one. But man, even in his highest aspirations, goes sometimes to excess. Some of our best Lutherans of the German type are open to this criticism. The matchless development of the land of the Reformation undoubtedly impressed the Germans with the idea of being a privileged people. And there is hardly a nation on the face of the earth which would deny this to be a fact. Or has not the Reformation of the 16th century extended its blessed influence over the whole German people? This immense progress, the Lutheran Church, the leading denomination of Germany, had made since the hammer blows of that famous Wittenberg monk in 1517, the powerful words which flowed from the lips of Martin Luther and were the death-knell of political and religious tyranny, the marvelous influence of the life and literature of this greatest of all Reformers upon German families throughout the whole land, led some to believe that the Lutheran Church is something specifically German and cannot be carried into other nationalities without being modified. If that were the case, Lutheranism would not have the world-mission, we like to ascribe to it.

Representing principles of truth which in the middle ages had almost sunk into oblivion, Lutheranism affords something which can be claimed by each individual and each nation. For truth is everywhere the same. It is truth in America and the Philippine Islands as well as it is in Germany. Consequently the truths of Lutheranism must be able to be taught in the English language as well as in any other. We send our missionaries to India and Africa and always see them first study the language of the people they go to bless with their teachings. We never think for a moment that the salvation of the heathen is dependent upon the home language of the missionary. On the contrary, we know that if the heathen understands and adopts the sweet gospel message, he will receive the blessings of Christianity. One should therefore never go so far as to say that the Lutheran faith can only be preached in the German language. For we know that the Scandinavian peoples are just as earnest Lutherans as the Germans, and from history we know that the greatest Lutheran treasures of the Reformation were laid down in the Latin language and forcibly discussed by its scholars. Since this is true of a dead language, how much more can it be said of a language which by its simple grammar and simplicity of style recommends itself to everyone.

We have now sufficiently demonstrated that the English language can convey the Lutheran ideas as well as any other language, and this fact should suggest the idea of coöperation. But the spirit of coöperation and centralization which has become one of the cardinal doctrines of the 20th century, has not been clearly recognized by many. National prejudices, love of one's own language, misunderstandings on account of the inability to see any good in the work of others, other methods of church work and so on, were the cause of harsh feelings and provoked many a battle. Of course, these fights between the German and English congregations are almost as old as their history on this continent. Heinrich Melchior Muehlenberg, the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America, Rev. Berkenmeyer and some others had

already preached in German and English without finding any opposition whatever.

But these peaceable endeavours could not continue everywhere. In Philadelphia, for instance, the English-speaking element of the Michaelis congregation under the leadership of General Peter Muehlenberg demanded, beside the two German ministers, an English preacher. A struggle began. The English element after having been voted down departed from that congregation to have services of their own.

The history of Michaelis congregation has more than once repeated itself. But not only congregations, but also synods suffered great changes on account of the language question. There is for instance the New York Ministerium. For twenty five years it was German, then for about fifty years its business meetings were conducted in the English tongue, until since 1867 it became again an entirely German body. The circumstance that it became again German must be explained by the fact that its English element departed, while its German congregations received fresh forces from immigration.

That, of course, during all these battles a good many Lutherans became the prey of other denominations, needs no special mention. For the same thing occurs nowadays, when the wants of one part of a mixed congregation are neglected.

The question now arises: What shall we do, when a German congregation has developed itself toward the English language so much that some of the young people are incapable of following the services in the German tongue? I know there are some who will sacrifice these young people. They will say, those young folks had a fine opportunity of learning German, but they were too proud or too lazy to do so. Now, *m. f.*, these reasons may often be well founded, but I doubt, if this is the case everywhere. Think, for instance, of those congregations, where the Low German is always the language of the home and no schools make the young people acquainted with High German. Say, do you wonder at all that in such congregations the younger generation is lost to the High-German—or, if you please, to the German church language? And

often even there, where the High-German has been taught in schools, the German instruction will never produce the well desired fruits on account of the lack of practice at home. For, if a language shall become a person's whole property, then it needs continual practice.

And supposing the young people do understand and speak the German tongue, are they not often compelled by inter marriage to ask for the use of the English tongue in their congregation, the language of their children? What shall we therefore do with the growing number of young people who wish to hear their Lutheran faith preached in the English language? I believe I have sufficiently shown the untenableness of the idea that the Lutheran doctrines could not be preached with the same force in the official language of this country.

I further believe, an exclusion of the English tongue from congregations of mixed membership would be equal to ecclesiastical suicide and never make the Lutheran Church the dominant factor in the religious life of America. But you say, let us be careful and not in too great a hurry. Haste has only too often been the cause of great harm. True, there have been sometimes in German and Scandinavian congregations inconsiderate demands for the English language, which were absolutely unnecessary, because the English speaking element well understood the German and Scandinavian languages.

True, here and there, the English-speaking element of a German congregation, though being in a very weak minority, has more than once thoughtlessly hastened the process of Americanizing, thus losing in its further development the good old leaders. But, on the other hand, we cannot deny that the Church missed many opportunities of growth by not providing with German and English speaking ministers those congregations which had reached that point of transition which demands services in two languages.

But here we have to consider that those congregations which are in a transitory state, will only fare well, when they prepare their period of transition intelligently. It goes without saying that only those ministers should be employed in this difficult

work who are able to treat with tact and fine understanding so delicate a matter. And when, do you think, shall they begin with the introduction of the English tongue? That is hard to say. In general, one shall not make a mistake in assuming that the time has come, when an overwhelming majority, with regard to the needful younger generation, think it necessary to provide the latter with the treasures of Lutheranism in the official language of this country. For then, through the influence of the older people, we have a guarantee of preserving, for the younger generation, the Lutheran doctrines in their full strength and purity. That a transition in a congregation takes place in this way, is to be hoped for. For, otherwise, what would become of the neglected children of the Church? Children neglected at home often run away, and no one really blames them for so doing. And where is the man that will blame a person for his departure from a Church that has failed to provide him with the spiritual food, for which his soul was craving? It is therefore necessary for the Church to give up her suicidal opposition, when circumstances advise a new road of ecclesiastical development, progress, and policy. And what will be the result of the new policy? Nothing more and nothing less than the fusion of the best and noblest elements of the German and English types of Lutheranism.

In order to secure this fusion, there must be a clear and distinct understanding between the different elements of the Church. To this end, the Germans and Scandinavians will approach the English speaking portion of the Lutheran Church, and, studying their practical methods of church work, find that there are excellent men and women among them, men and women from whom one can learn much in practical matters. On the other hand, the English-speaking portion of the Church will never forget that German scholarship and thoroughness are acknowledged the world over, and that it is only gross ignorance and superficial prejudice against the foreigner which denies this to be a fact. I am agreeably surprised that in the better circles of the American people the systematic educational work of the Germans finds increasing appreciation. One has

discovered that the clear headed German people which conscientiously pursues its aim with its substantial teachings had, indeed, something to offer. People who have a noble task are anxious to perform it. The efforts of German Lutheran theologians to preserve Lutheranism in its strength and purity are well known, and should be endorsed by those English brethren who more than once were in danger of being captured by false ideas of Lutheranism.

We certainly like freedom of thought. No Church ever made more concessions in this respect than the Church, which rang the death knell of every kind of tyranny. But, there is a limit to everything. Freedom and liberty must therefore never go so far as to endanger the mighty historical dome of Lutheranism, and Lutheran theologians must never forget that unity of thought and efforts means strength. This weighty consideration suggests the idea of hearty coöperation.

There is well founded hope that a better mutual understanding will lead to a better mutual appreciation. During the last few years much progress has been made in that direction. A better knowledge of languages has, to a large degree, caused this well desired change. And there is confident expectation that still more success will be achieved by the energetic efforts of the best men of the Church. Uniting their powers and assisting each other in the spirit of generous rivalry, they will create a common road of hearty coöperation and produce out of the different elements the Church of the future.

One of the main factors to bring about this great Church of the future is the theological seminary. The latter will not only take care of the student's moral and spiritual welfare, but also pay its highest attention to his intellectual equipment. It will show him the sacred treasures and traditions of his Church in their whole splendor and force, and render the German and Scandinavian student capable of preaching in the English tongue those grand old Bible truths that will not perish, even if the home language disappears.

The question, Shall the German and Scandinavian student in bi-lingual institutions be instructed through the medium of

his own tongue in the official language of this country, is of secondary importance and should be decided by the faculty in favor of the foreign language, if circumstances demand it. The main thing is that the foreign student remains in close contact with the English students and through them with the social and ecclesiastical life of the people. Many great factors influence the American nation. Lutheranism is destined to play in it one of the most prominent parts. The Chief Executive of the United States acknowledged it himself, when he spoke about the great educational tasks of the Lutheran Church. Shall therefore the development of this great Church become still more glorious; shall her efficiency become still more intense; shall she, as the leading Church of Germany and other countries, become also in America the first Church and thus exceed even the prophecy of brave Theodore Roosevelt in regard to her splendid future, then she must concentrate her whole powers upon the language question that the fruits of long years of hard pioneer work may not be lost.



## ARTICLE VII.

## A REVIEW OF THE FOURTH INTERSYNODICAL CONFERENCE AT FT. WAYNE, IND., (AUG. 8-10, 1905).

BY PROFESSOR F. A. SCHMIDT, D.D.

The fourth intersynodical Conference had an attendance only about half as large as that of the third Conference, held the year before in Detroit. As to the mode of procedure this gathering decided that each speaker should be allowed only ten minutes.

In giving a brief survey of the proceedings, I intend to confine myself as much as possible to the main questions that were discussed, and to leave out of consideration various subordinate questions of a secondary nature. As a matter of course, much that had often been discussed in previous times was repeated on both sides without bringing the controversy in any manner nearer to the desired goal: A conclusion, scriptural and confessional. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that also the Conference at Fort Wayne stands for the exertion of some enduring influence on the necessary development of the controversy.

The contrast between the contending parties stood forth in its clearness and ruggedness. The fundamental passage, Eph. 1 : 4, about the election of grace, constituted the basis of, or the point of departure in, the discussion. On certain questions of importance all minds were already agreed. It is generally acknowledged that a "secret," a great world of wonders, with unsearchable paths and inconceivable judgments, lies before man when he discusses the eternal decree of foreordination to salvation and its practical execution. But this secret will have an essentially different character and import according to the position taken to the universal will of grace. The universal will of grace may be considered as strictly executing itself behind the unsearchable *or*, by the side of the universal will of grace and independent of it, a particular will of election may be advanced as an unrevealed, secret regulation of the foreordination to salvation.

The "exelaxato," *i. e.* he "chose" us, was, in accordance with the concept "election," understood in the same way, at least by the majority of the leading speakers. The "choice" is a taking out, picking out, of the multitude of the human race, which is a fallen one in Adam, a redeemed one through Christ.

"We are chosen"—is what *Lehre und Wehre*, p. 371, correctly writes—"out of the *massa perdit*a, and, we add, out of the human race redeemed through Christ." Through his choice, *i. e.*, election, picking out of the *massa perdit*a God has decreed to divide the redeemed human race into two parts: *salvandi et non salvandi*, those to be saved and those not to be saved. This being so, those who, after the decree to salvation has been made, remain as non-elect in the *massa perdit*a are thus and therewith excluded from the final salvation, even if they should for some time in this life through baptism and faith become members of the true Church of God. This article, that God decreed *Wahl der Gnade* (election of grace) constitutes the real separation (*discretio*) between those to be saved and those not to be saved, is especially worthy of notice.

Also on another matter the agreement was general: That the motive of the election, the principle of separation, lies in the purpose and good pleasure of God. He alone determines and establishes what individual persons He will elect out of the lost and redeemed mass of the human race for the purpose of saving them. No one can prescribe anything to Him in regard to this. His sole good pleasure, his sole purpose is the only norm and rule according to which He, in this respect, decrees as well as acts. Predestination is decreed by Him, and also the attendant execution is His work.

As soon however as the question was raised in what the "purpose" or the motive of the "good pleasure" consists, the difference became at once a glaring one. The apostle says, We are chosen "in Christ." With reference to this it was emphasized by our side [Iowa and Ohio] that Christ as Mediator and Author of the new universal covenant of grace is also the sphere or the periphery within which the election of grace shall and can take place—and has in fact taken place—according to

the measure determined by the dispensation of the covenant of grace. The new covenant of grace, as it concerns all sinners, knows only of this, that "whosoever believeth on Him" has according to God's will eternal life. On the basis of the covenant of grace founded in Christ, faith in the Saviour is always the necessary condition and presupposition for the predestination or foreordination to salvation. With respect to a separation of persons into those to be saved and those not to be saved, the covenant of grace, established through Christ as the Mediator between God and our sinful world, knows only of repentance and faith, only of following the universal order of salvation established in this new covenant as the sole motive of separation between those that *are* to be saved out of the lost multitude and those that *are not* to be saved, *i. e.*, between the elect and the non elect, if election in its strict sense of the ultimate foreordination and predestination be regarded as the final aim. The gospel, as the doctrine of grace for all men, knows nothing of a will or decree of God to save certain persons or sinners without asking beforehand about their faith. For this gospel always proclaims this only: *Who believes, shall be saved.* The "purpose" of predestination, as it has been revealed in the new covenant is this: "(1) For God so *loved* the world, (2) that he gave his only begotten *Son*, (3) *that whosoever believeth on him* should not perish, but have eternal life." In the gospel's covenant of grace the mercy of the Father and the merit of the Son do not at all exclude faith as the condition of the decree to salvation. On the contrary, the rule "Who believes shall be saved," constitutes very plainly and decidedly that "purpose of election" which is clearly revealed in the gospel, namely, "that (auf dass) all who believe (and no other) shall have eternal life." Not less as plainly and positively is God's "good pleasure" revealed in the words of Paul, as determining "in Christ" who are to be saved, and as executing this determination in him. Paul writes in 1 Cor. 1, 21: *It was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.* As true as it then is that the "election" is "revealed" to us in the gospel, so certain it is that the gospel presents the

order of repentance and faith as the decisive purpose and discrete good pleasure in virtue of which it has come to a predestination separating some from others. For Christ, in whom we are chosen, is certainly "the Book of Life" for all men, as far as the gracious will of God to salvation is concerned. However, when the question is one regarding the *firm decree* to salvation, He is for those only who believe on Him—who appropriate to themselves His offered merit or "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ"—the decisive motive of their predestination or foreordination to salvation, because God in His eternal counsel of election has firmly decreed and determined that He, beyond those who acknowledge his Son Jesus Christ and truly believe on him, will save no one (Müller, 556). It is thus clear that the "us" in Eph. 1, 4, does not apply to "certain men" or "sinners" who like those that are born of the flesh are still unbelievers; but it applies to those who do not thrust away from themselves the gospel of grace, but consent in faith to become partakers of Christ's merit through the proffered mercy. For thus only has God, according to the third verse, "blessed us with all spiritual blessing in heavenly things, through Christ." The blessing of the heavenly things is given only to those who in faith accept the promise, and it presupposes this faith as the necessary condition, as the proper means of accepting the gift of blessing (Rom. 3, 30-33; 11, 31-32; Gal. 3, 14-22; Hebr. 4, 2). And the execution of this—as the imparting of the blessing—which takes place in this life, is the true adequate counterpart of the decree of predestination issued in eternity. In both—in the eternal election and in the temporal blessing—faith in the Saviour of sinners, occupies, according to Paul, the same position in conformity with the purpose and good pleasure of God. He has blessed us (believers) in the temporal world with the blessings of Christ. He has likewise before the foundation of the world elected and predestined us (believers) to be the objects of his communication of blessing.

Our opponents, the speakers on the side of the Synodal Conference, were entirely dissatisfied with this understanding of

Eph. I. We were dogmatizing, not exegeting, was the oft repeated refrain of our opponents. They claimed that the analogy between the covenant of grace, founded in the gospel for all sinners, and the purpose and good will which the gospel reveals as universally valid, has nothing to do with the understanding of the Scripture passages which treat of election as an electing predestination to true salvation. Of course has Christ, they asserted, through his work of redemption made this choice or election out of the lost multitude of sinners possible, and in so far we are chosen in Christ. But the real motive of the predestination to life is neither Christ Himself, nor the Father in Him, but the sole *Eudokia* (good pleasure) of God in certain persons in the alike lost, alike redeemed, but yet alike unbelieving multitude. For the unchangeable "purpose" of God, through which certain persons shall for certainty obtain eternal salvation does not apply to *believers as such*, but simply to *men as such*, persons, sinners, children of Adam in the same multitude, as they all alike yet lie in the same sinful condition, and are the children of wrath, even as the rest. The election decreeing to salvation, our opponents further claimed, is the beginning and source of the blessing which is imparted to these persons above others, but it is nevertheless as a matter of course an unchangeable predestination to *unerring salvation*, a firm decree regarding their obtaining salvation regardless of conditioning repentance and faith. The decree not only brings them to the supreme goal of salvation: it gives them salvation and all that leads to it and is necessary as way and means to obtain it. The *firm decree*—to save certain persons, who as parts of the multitude are viewed as still lying in complete corruption, but not as embracing in faith the grace of Jesus Christ—also includes from the beginning, as a no less firm decree and purpose, all that is necessary to their salvation. This "*Wahlvorsatz Gottes*" (God's purpose of election) they asserted, is so certain and infallible in its execution that *neither the Devil, nor the world nor our own flesh can put it to naught* (*Lehre u. Wehre*, p. 371). And all this—not by virtue of the universal order followed, but simply by the virtue of the special purpose

of election which does not refer to all men, is not revealed in the order of salvation, and has not its corresponding motive and rule in the universal covenant of grace, but is, much more, according to its *essence* and its *execution* on the whole a particular will of election and purpose of election. They claimed that to advance here, as we did, a principle "in view of faith" or an adherence, of whatsoever kind, to the order of salvation as the dividing principle or rule of separation, did not agree with the Scripture passages which treat of this election as distinct from the universal counsel of salvation and its order. The election in strict sense, they said, was an initial separation of persons, a separation standing at the very head of the order of grace. "Chosen us" does therefore not signify "us as believers," but this only: God has predestinated "us as yet lying in our original condition," (1) to a firmly and securely guaranteed salvation, and therefore (2) to all that leads us safely to this goal.

That was the well known contrast respecting the main question for discussion. I do not think that my presentation of this can by any one be justly considered as incorrect or misleading. On our side we here emphasized repeatedly that we in a decided manner should have to reject any exegesis so manipulated as to get out of "*sedibus*" a *special particular will of grace*, a second will to salvation which not only differs essentially from the universal will of grace for the whole sinful world revealed in the gospel, but also stands in diametrical opposition to it, especially in regard to the elect themselves. For when on the one hand the universal will of grace connects the ordination to salvation strictly with the condition of being persevering in faith, this particular will of grace, on the other hand, firmly foreordains sinners as such to virtual salvation, irrespective of Christ's merit laid hold of in faith, and it makes on the contrary Christ laid hold of in faith only the consequence and effect of this absolute purpose—election.

The Word of God contains only two doctrines about God's will to salvation and both concern all men. The will of the law requires one to be righteous by fulfilling the law. The will

of grace, revealed in the gospel, proclaims Christ to us as Saviour of the world and the Book of Life for all men. It offers them through the call of grace and the means of grace all that is necessary for being saved; it makes, however, in all its utterances the real *foreordination* to adoption and inheritance of eternal life dependent on whether the called sinner accept Christ or not. The doctrine of election in Holy Scripture is an *article in the universal gospel*, not a special doctrine of grace which does not concern all men, but altogether only the few elect.

The teaching of our opponents manifestly set up a *third doctrine* about God's will to salvation by the side of and outside of law and gospel. They advance, by the side of the universal will of grace revealed in the gospel, a special will of grace as revealed in the Scripture passages treating of election of grace. The following statements will make the situation clear:

1. The universal will of grace concerns all men without exception, but the will revealing itself in the election concerns only the elect, only "certain persons" in the multitude of lost humanity. The election as act of the will, as purpose, as good pleasure, as decree, does not extend to all men, but is, before every consideration of the relation of the called, already *from the beginning particular*, and limits itself only to certain persons in the multitude of sinners. The election-grace, or the election-love, *i. e.*, the grace and love to save sinners, which realizes itself in the election act is not according to its concept universal and does not extend itself in unity and equality of the will to all men, but is simply a "particular will of election" which exists and has its own essence by the side of and apart from the universal will of grace.

2. The universal will of grace as well as the particular will of election, according to the claims of our opponents treats of foreordination and predestination to salvation, however, in an essentially different manner. In the universal will of grace, revealed and proclaimed by the gospel as of concern to all sinners, there can be no talk about foreordaining sinners to salvation, no talk about a firm properly decreed predestination of



sinner to eternal life before God has offered the sinner through his gracious call Christ's saving merit and before they have laid hold of it in faith. Here the firm purpose of the order of salvation has absolute validity: Who believes shall be saved, who does not believe shall be excluded from the blessing of Christ's merit. In the "particular will of election" of our opponents the firm foreordination to salvation in a like manner constitutes the chief contents. But they deny that this actual predestination to salvation is dependent on the faithful laying hold of Christ's merit, and they transfer it over to a secret, unrevealed divine will of separation, according to which only a few, out of the whole multitude of lost sinners, are foreordained to salvation. This *a priori* will of separation they, like Calvin, designate "a secret."

3. The universal will of grace as the particular will of election is, according to the doctrine of our opponents, a "cause" in view of salvation of sinners, again, however, in a very different manner. The universal will of grace is not, according to its essence, a decreeing will, which with necessity establishes the unerring execution of that which is willed, but is an impeding will, being a will conceived in a definite arrangement of the means and the resistible mode of operation. The gracious particular will of election, on the contrary, which concerns only the few elect is, according to its essence and concept, *at once also an irresistible decreeing will*, an unchangeable purpose which with necessity executes itself in spite of the Devil, of the world, yea, even of "the flesh" of the elect; for this unavoidable termination no mediating explanation is furnished by a following of the order of grace. The others, on the contrary, are abandoned to their natural, carnal freedom of choice, so that the universal way of salvation with its resistible grace offers to them just as little of the necessary aid to salvation as if no way of salvation ever existed for them. It is utterly impossible for them to walk the way of salvation. And it is just as impossible for the elect to retain any real possibility whatever of not walking the way leading to salvation, for the unchangeable purpose excludes from beforehand in their case every real possi-



bility of forfeiting their salvation—they "shall and must" in spite of everything again and again find favor with God, it may turn out with others as it pleases.

4. That is the special consolation which this particular will of grace guarantees and insures for those whom it concerns. Also in the universal will of grace is indeed mention made of consolation and blessing, grace and salvation; but "*of what avail is the richest blessing, if it is not certain?*" (Dr. Stöckhardt in Fort Wayne). That all is from the beginning guaranteed and absolutely promised.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### CONFIRMATION.

BY REV. UPTON A. HANKEY, A.M.

In recent years the youth have come into greater prominence in the Church. This is the Lord's will. Christian parents, presenting their children in holy baptism, solemnly pledge themselves to "bring them up in the murture and admonition of the Lord." Under the wise, tender, constant pressure of the mother in the home and the influences of the Sunday School, these children are gradually led along until they find their way into the pastor's catechetical class. Here he receives them, and faithfully instructs them in religious truth, until they know something of sin and grace, and are led nearer to the Saviour, whom they love, and in whom they believe.

The faith of their hearts must be publicly, personally professed; for the Word of God says: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Christ also says: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." As the promises are all made to those who thus do confess, it is evident there are none to those who do not confess. This public profession is made, and the catechumens inducted into the full privileges of the Church, by what we call the impres-

sive rite of Confirmation. In other words, Confirmation is the opportunity which the Church affords to all baptized persons to confess Christ publicly, in the acceptance of their baptismal vows, and in the unreserved surrender of themselves to the God of love and grace. The most appropriate time to make this required profession is when the youth desire to be admitted to the privileges of full and accepted members.

Our Liturgy says: "The rite of Confirmation is not a Sacrament, but an ordinance of the Church." It grows out of the doctrine and practice of infant baptism, which we believe to be Scriptural, and is connected with infant baptism as its ratification. We do not claim for the ordinance a direct "thus saith the Lord;" it lacks Sacramental efficacy; it means no new vows; it rests on no direct Scriptural proofs; it is not an ordinance of the Lord's, but a work of the Holy Spirit. How then did Confirmation arise? It was introduced about the close of the second century, after the distinction of presbyters and bishops had sprung up in the Church. Upon the baptism followed an anointing, *χρίσμα*, and then the laying on of hands. In the Eastern Church presbyters and deacons were permitted to dispense baptism including also anointing and laying on of hands. But in the Western Church the bishops claimed the exclusive right of the laying on of hands. When the bishop did not dispense the baptism, the laying on of hands as well as the anointing was given separately by him as Confirmation, which separation, even when the baptism was administered by a bishop, soon became the usual practice. Thus the bishop claimed the right of authenticating, or confirming the baptism of all those who had been baptized by presbyters or deacons. If the bishop was present the Confirmation took place immediately after the baptism; if not, it was deferred to the next convenient season.

In course of time this rite became incumbered by superstitious ceremonies, and soon thereafter was erected into a sacrament in the Roman Catholic Church, and entirely separated from baptism.

Luther, in a sermon on the Mass in 1520, follows the pre-

vailing theory as to the number of sacraments, mentioning confirmation as a sacrament. Later, however, he points out "the absence of any divine Word of promise attaching specifically to Confirmation," and calls it an "ecclesiastical custom." The Roman Catholic rite with its appendages was abolished in the Reformation, and in Luther's Order for Divine Service there is no reference to Confirmation. In many places it was abolished, and some of the churches in Germany have it not to this day. Melancthon, in his Apology to the Augsburg Confession says: "Confirmatio (et extrema unctio) sunt ritus accepti a Patribus, quos ne ecclesia quidem tanquam necessarios ad salutem requirit, quod non habent mandatum Dei." Is it not quite certain that opposition to the sacramental character of Confirmation, as taught in the Romish Church, led the Reformers to a too depreciatory view of the rite of Confirmation? Was it not easy to go to the other extreme of diminishing view? And is it not possible today to have too inadequate notions in respect of the rite of Confirmation? That it is a merely beautiful human ceremony, not at all essential, to be used, or despised, according to personal option, seems to be a low and inadequate conception of the rite, and has led some extreme jurists among the sects, since the Reformation, and as well among our own Churches, to set it aside as unscriptural and unevangelical.

This peculiar form of receiving the public profession of individuals appears to be in the Church by direction of the *renewing, unerring, and ever fruitful Divine Spirit*. Martensen says: "Confirmation is not an ordinance of the Lord's, but must be regarded as the work of the Spirit in the Church." It is enough, therefore, to say upon authority for its use that it is the appointment of the Church by the direction of the Divine Spirit. We find it in the pure age of the Church immediately succeeding the Apostolic. By analogy at least it has Biblical support, and is, therefore, not an arbitrary injunction of the Church, but wholly in accord with the tenor and spirit of the Scriptures. "Laying on of hands" was a ceremony used on different occasions, in the first years of Christianity. Upon the

sick the Apostles laid their hands when they would recover them. In the ordination of anyone to either of the orders of the ministry, "laying on of hands" was used. And sometimes in sending out evangelists upon their work, recourse was had to this significant ceremony. The "laying on of hands," as mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is connected with baptism, and several other things, as "the foundation," in the Christian life. As the "laying on of hands," in healing the sick, or in ordination, concerned only a few exclusively, there must have been some other occasion of using this rite, in which all Christians could partake, if it belonged to the principles of the Christian faith. Delitzsch, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, says: "It is very significant—and, as in the case of every other apostolic word, it demands serious consideration here—that the author of this Epistle reckons the doctrine of the imposition of hands among the fundamental articles of Christianity. As the purpose of the ordinance was to qualify for independent participation in the official work of the Christian Church, its separation in time from baptism (with which it was not always connected even in the apostolic age) has been necessitated since the Church began regularly to renew herself out of the bosom of the family, and so children to be ordinarily baptized; but it still continues a fundamental condition of the revival of church life that Confirmation be restored to its proper place as a complement to baptism, and that the imposition of hands be regarded as the means of imparting the gift of the Holy Ghost, which the Church, in virtue of being the body of Christ, and having dwelling within her the fulness of His Spirit, is empowered to dispense. It is not meant that the imposition of hands is to be regarded as a sacrament in the sense in which baptism and the Lord's Supper are so: still something of a sacramental character attaches to it; for while, on the one hand, it is an apostolic ordinance in which the Lord's own example is followed, it is on the other hand, by virtue of the word of prayer and blessing connected with it, an effectual means of conveying heavenly (although for the time no longer extraordinary) gifts." Dr. Delitzsch further raises

the question: "How can we imagine that the Apostolic writer here (Heb. 6: 2) would have reckoned the ἐπιθεσις Χειρῶν along with baptism among the fundamentals of Christianity, if he had not regarded it as a sacred ordinance, with a promise of grace attached to it?" Are we in error, when we recognize the integral significance of this rite of the imposition of hands in Confirmation, as well as in ordination? Hoffman "On the Right Administration of Confirmation," speaks thus, with special reference to Heb. 6: 2: "By baptism the believer is separated from the world, and brought into communion or fellowship with Christ; by the laying on of hands he is, as it were, while still in the world, inwardly glorified, and wondrously provided with strength for conflict and for service."

The term "Confirmation" is defined to be a strengthening, fixing, or establishing any matter to which it refers. As applied to this rite, it means the strengthening, or establishing the Christian character and profession of those who come to engage in it. Confirmation is just what the word means,—being made strong. The persons confirmed renew their baptismal covenant, and by the gracious help of the Holy Spirit, their faith and moral purposes are strengthened.

The services usually connected with this rite are: A hymn suitable to the occasion, a prayer, and an appropriate discourse. The subjects, in a standing posture, then present themselves before the altar of the Church. The pastor proposes to them the questions found in the Liturgy, to which they respond affirmatively. The nature of these questions should be explained privately to the class before the public service of Confirmation is held. The subjects are requested to kneel, then the pastor places his hands upon the head of each one, and offers up a prayer. After rising to their feet he extends his right hand to each, saying: "Upon these, your voluntary professions and promises," etc. A prayer and hymn conclude the service. This is the simple, and appropriate service of Confirmation.

We do not regard it as the act of uniting with the Church, as some people suppose, and as pastors by their remarks lead people to believe. How often older members will take the

catechumen by the hand, following the ceremony of Confirmation, and say: "I was pleased to see you join the Church today." Sometimes the pastor says to his class: "All those who wish to unite with the Church will please hand me their names." Union with the Church of Jesus Christ takes place in Holy Baptism, and not in Confirmation. In baptism the seal of the Covenant is fixed; the Saviour establishing this Sacrament as the means of admission into His kingdom.

Confirmation is, in one sense, the act of the catechumen, and refers "to the solemn promise and vow that was made at baptism," and ratifies and confirms that vow. It is the public assumption of a covenant previously made with God. Thus the subject, by personal profession, confirms, or establishes his obligations to Christ as one of His disciples, and openly avows a purpose to take up the cross and follow Christ, to renounce the evils of the world, and to keep obediently God's holy will and commandments. Instrumentally it is the pastor's act in the name and authority of God. He certifies the catechumen of the grace of God, and by prayer obtains the strengthening influence of the Holy Spirit. As Christ's ambassador he applies the means of grace. While we place no superstitious dependence upon the "laying on of hands," yet this is more than mere symbolism, especially if Confirmation is in the Christian Church as a work of the Spirit, then the Spirit is here given as the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and the true godliness. But the special object of "the laying on of hands" is to point out the persons for whom prayer is offered, and in whose behalf the blessings of the covenant are sought. But the confirming and establishing of the catechumen in grace, is *primarily the Holy Spirit's work through the Word*. It is the part of God to confirm and strengthen the catechumen in faith and moral purpose to keep the vows assumed. The spiritual preparation, or qualifications, of those who engage in this rite, are matters of moment. If this office were a mere device of man, a human arrangement, participating in it would not be of so serious import. But an institution, of which God's Spirit is

the author, requires proper seriousness, and due preparation. We look for special fitness in those upon whom hands are laid in Confirmation. It will not do to admit into full and accepted membership catechumens without the proper qualifications; for that would build up a cold, formal, worldly congregation, creating a situation fraught with absolute danger and many evil consequences to both the pastor and the church over which he presides. Dr. J. G. Morris, in his "Autobiography" says: "Every year of my pastoral life, at the First Church, I instructed a class in the catechism, and confirmed those whom I could with a good conscience admit to the full privileges of membership. I occasionally gave great offense by rejecting some, who merely learned the lessons as they would a school task, and the sooner it was over the better. Personal religion made no part of the business, but it was merely a mechanical process from beginning to end. Such I did not confirm." To admit to Confirmation all catechumens regardless of spiritual qualifications must be condemned. It will bring into the Church many who have not sincerely repented of their sins, and accepted Christ. So important is this matter that our Formula of Government gives advice on this subject, saying: "It shall be the duty of the Council to admit to membership adults, who shall make application, and whom, on mature examination, they shall judge to be possessed of the qualifications hereafter specified. They shall be obedient subjects of divine grace—that is, they must satisfy the Church Council that they have sincerely repented of their sins, and do truly believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Also to admit to the Communion of the Church all those who were admitted to church membership in their infancy, and whom on like examination, they shall judge possessed of the above-mentioned qualifications. No one shall be considered a fit subject for Confirmation who has not previously attended a course of religious lectures delivered by the pastor, on the most important doctrines and principles of religion."

The qualifications necessary are a certain amount of Christian knowledge, and a changed heart. In respect of knowledge,



they should be able to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; also to answer such other questions as are contained in the Catechism. They should not only know these forms of knowledge, but also understand their meaning and intention, for;

"Knowledge, alas! 'tis all in vain,  
And all in vain our fear;  
Our stubborn sins will fight and reign,  
If love be absent there."

The subjects should experience such a gracious operation of the Holy Spirit upon their wills, as will lead them "to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things."

Also, there should be brought to the minds of the catechumens, as something necessary for thought and understanding, "the promise and vow which were made in their baptism." By reference to the order for the administration of baptism, this promise and vow are expressed in their parts, and are found to contain the solemn pledge to renounce all evil, to believe in and follow that which is good. The fact that such vows were made, and the nature of them, are also part of the knowledge and understanding requisite for those who should engage in the solemn rite of Confirmation. The object to be sought after in this enlightening knowledge is a converted heart. The catechumens are required "with their own mouth and consent, openly before the Church, to ratify and confirm" the promise made in their baptism. They are also "to promise that they will evermore endeavor faithfully to observe all those things," which were then promised for them. The sum of requisites is: Repentance, whereby the catechumen forsakes sin, and faith, whereby he believes the promises of God; thus a personal, public profession of religion is made, according to the requirements of Scripture, and the method which the Church has appointed by the wisdom of the Spirit. Dr. Martensen says: "If the practice of Confirmation in the Evangelical Church corresponded perfectly with its theory, it would be an outward declaration that the personal life of faith was now beginning to manifest itself in power, and that a Pentecost was dawning



upon the youth. For as this ordinance is upon the Church's part a consecration to a personal life of faith, and an act of admission to the rights and responsibilities of years of understanding, the youth himself must witness the good confession before many witnesses, and thus avow himself a member of the Church founded by the Apostles. The work, therefore, of instruction for Confirmation, as well as of Christian training generally, must be, so far as lies in human power, so to teach as to give confirmation a really *awakening* import, that it may serve to awaken in youth holy promises and resolutions, but, above all, holy joy on account of the grace of baptism, on account of the richness of the promises which are given to them in the new covenant."

Look, for a moment, at the nature of the profession which they make who engage in this rite. In the Order for Confirmation, following the preface which introduces the rite, the pastor asks for the personal profession of each catechumen: "Do you this day, in the presence of God and of this assembly, renew the solemn promise and vow made in your name, at your baptism; do you ratify and confirm the same; and do you acknowledge yourselves bound to believe and do all those things which your parents then promised or undertook for you?" To this personal question the response is, "I do;" a brief reply, but as extensive as the question previously proposed. Thus, in the presence of God, who searches hearts, and before the congregation, who are witnesses of the profession, each catechumen professes "to renew the solemn promise and vow" made at baptism; this is required whether they were baptized as infants or adults. The promise which the catechumen professes to renew is "to renounce Satan and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that you will not follow, nor be led by them." Renouncing these—the devil, the sinful world, the flesh, is "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, and living soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." The promise which they renew is also "to believe what is taught in the Apostle's Creed," and also, "to obediently

keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of their life." The simple promise "I do," is large, and solemn; it expresses the catechumen's understanding of what he is to believe and assume; it also expresses the conversion of his heart to God. The profession here made refers to acts past, and declares a purpose for the future; it is on the one hand a voluntary approval, and on the other a solemn promise in respect of what a Christian ought to believe and do for the salvation of his soul. This profession sweeps the whole circle of life and duty, and sums up all that is required in the divine word; it accepts the law of discipleship laid down by the Lord: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me." Confirmation in our Church is closely connected with baptism, and presupposes it. St. Thomas of Aquino says: "*Character confirmationis ex necessitate prae-supponit characterem baptismatem.*" The concluding question of Part VI, of the Sacrament of Baptism, in Luther's Catechism is: "What is required of those, who were baptised in their infancy?" Answer: "That they should make a personal profession of religion, that is, should *confirm* the vows made for them at their baptisms, so soon as they attain the years of discretion." No baptized children can ever be released from the obligation to confirm their baptismal covenant, and those who refuse become covenant-breakers. Confirmation is the solemn opportunity which the Church offers to all baptized persons to confirm, or ratify publicly in their own names that which their parents, or sponsors, promised or undertook for them. Thus this rite grows naturally out of the doctrine and practice of infant baptism. It does not complete baptism, it is already complete. It does not renew it, for it is made but once. It simply assumes, or expresses, that which has been entered into in the covenant of baptism. Confirmation is then simply thus: It is as persons understanding their baptismal vows, and seeing their duty in regard to them, coming before God and in the presence of the congregation acknowledging these vows, assuming them, and receiving the promised gift of the Holy Spirit to make strong in them their faith and

purpose of obedience. It is more than a human rite, machinery without the oil of divine grace, or a merely beautiful ceremony, that can be had or dispensed with. It becomes necessary to complete our system, and without it, we grieve the Spirit who placed it in the Church by His wisdom.

Catechisation and confirmation were originally unconnected rites. Catechumens in the early years of Christianity were adult heathen, who having become impressed with the truth of the Christian religion, and willing to accept it, were gathered into a class for the purpose of instruction in the principles of Christian doctrine and practice, and at the close of the course of instruction were received as full members by baptism, but without separate confirmation. This catechumenical system began in the second century, and ended about the sixth. But as the rising generation began chiefly to be the offspring of Christian parents, and were baptized in infancy, catechisation looked to the fulfillment of baptismal vows, and to preparation for Confirmation. For this rite, at first, in the Romish Church, no instruction was given in preparation. Catechetical instruction of the young, in preparation for Confirmation, may be said to be chiefly a Protestant institution. It is Scriptural and according to Christ's commission, "baptizing them and teaching them." Saint Luke writes to Theophilus, "*ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ τῶν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.*" Faith cometh by hearing; it is an act of the human will in response to the word of truth which is lodged in the mind through instruction, or by reading the Word. St. Paul says to the Ephesians: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your Salvation in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."

The Lutheran doctrine of infant baptism involves the idea of religious instruction, nurture, catechisation; and when parents send their children to the pastor seeking his aid in catechetical instruction, they are endeavoring to fulfill their plain promises.

Thus catechetical instruction lays the foundation and paves

the way for a personal profession of religion, which profession is made public in the Confirmation. After the pastor has faithfully catechised those under his care, and has awakened and filled their minds with religious knowledge, and has come to the conviction that a gracious operation of the Holy Spirit has taken place in the heart and will, he calls them before the altar of Christ's Church, and receives their confession of faith, and solemn pledge of obedience, in their Confirmation.

## ARTICLE IX.

### THE GENERIC IDEA OF THE SERMON.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.

Professor Phelps says : " A sermon is an oral address to the popular mind on a religious theme contained in the Scriptures." Accepting this definition of a sermon as a correct one we perceive that a sermon is different from any and every other discourse delivered to men, since it contains as its most important element, as its material content, a message, or a lesson from the Divine Word. It is this its Scriptural element that distinguishes it from secular orations, or from scientific lectures. Unless it find its theme and its materials in the Scriptures it cannot, according to popular apprehension, be regarded as a sermon, however eloquent it may be in delivery and however instructive in content.

1. *The sermon as an oral discourse.* The sermon is not a book, nor an essay, which seek only to inform the understanding and to convince the reason by being read where there is ample time for reflection. The sermon is a discourse to be delivered *viva voce*. Consequently it should be constructed with that end in view. Its thought, arrangement, language, illustrations, movement, must be such as will adapt it to be spoken, and to make its impression in the passing moment. Its thought must be lucid and easy of apprehension. Its language must be simple, plain and forcible. Its illustrations must be clear and apt. Its movement must be rapid and energetic. These are

qualities requisite to all good oral discourse, and the presence in due proportion of these qualities in a composition will adapt it to be spoken, and if properly spoken, will make it effective as an address to the popular mind. Undoubtedly the ideal discourse would be produced without pen, but not without premeditation and prearrangement, for it may be set down as certain that what has cost the preacher but little thought will not produce any considerable effect on the audience. And thoughts however good, however profound, need systematic and logical arrangement in order to produce the best effect. A good sermon is not an ephemeral production. Back of it lies much general or special preparation. A man who does study, does not acquire information and does not cultivate the habit of carefully thinking out his sermons, will never be a good preacher.

Professor Phelps says: "The custom of preaching written discourses grows out of mental infirmity." Under man's present limited ability, the best sermon, doubtless, is that which combines the weight of written composition with the fluency, the versatility, the rapid transition of extemporaneous speech. The pen should be used for composing, arranging, condensing the thought of the sermon, but the delivery, after the thought has been mastered, should be left to the inspiration of the occasion. By this method the most effective discourses have been preached. Preachers who, after a few years of ministerial study and experience, write books or articles for newspapers and magazines, may compose their sermons in outline and arrange their illustrations without pen. But no preacher can afford to throw away his pen. It is an indispensable assistant to thought. But, while a man is yet comparatively young, he can easily acquire the habit of committing to memory the chief portions of his sermons, and of delivering them without the presence of the manuscript. This would not be preaching off-hand. Neither would such preaching have the mechanical effect that usually results where the sermon has been committed *verbatim*.

When a sermon is carefully prepared and is delivered as we

suggest, opportunity will be given the preacher to simplify and to popularize many points contained in the mere formal discourse, and for adapting it to the instantaneously arising demands of the occasion. In this way many a preacher has succeeded in making the best impressions.

2. *The Sermon is an address to the popular mind.* The sermon is not a scientific lecture, nor a forensic plea, nor a senatorial argument, nor a demagogic harangue. The audience is never select, whether it be select in ignorance, or select in intelligence. As a rule it is made up of people of varying degrees of intellectual and moral condition. In almost every religious assembly there are the intelligent and the ignorant. There are the pious and the worldly-minded. The test of a good sermon is that it meets the intellectual wants of the learned and of the unlearned, and that it contains some spiritual instruction suited to the religious and moral condition of all classes of hearers. This does not imply that some parts shall be meager in thought to suit those of small intelligence; and that other parts should be grander and profounder in thought to suit the more intelligent. It implies that the sermon should contain ample thought, but that the thought should be clear and distinct in conception, and should be expressed in plain and simple language. Its thought will commend it to all. Its language will make it acceptable to the uneducated. The language of the schools, and the "academic manner-primness," both in conception and in expression, should be excluded from all preaching. The lofty subjects of preaching should be brought down to a level with the comprehension of the unintelligent class of hearers, which may be done without the sacrifice of scholarly dignity or without even the possibility of offence to the educated.

Dr. Alexander says: "Don't leave humanity at the foot of the pulpit stairs—talk like other men—as any profoundly thinking, thoroughly agitated man would talk on a great subject to a casual group of waiting persons also deeply agitated. The democracy must be reached—people must be made to feel that the heart of the minister is with them. Common people

require this. Age requires it. Young men require it." One chief aim of the pulpit—one that must never be lost sight of—is that it must instruct the ignorant and elevate the lowly. This it can best do by adopting a mode of thought and a style of expression which they can fully grasp, and which, by the very instruction imparted, have an uplifting tendency.

Such being the aim of the sermon, it is to be judged by its effect upon the *popular mind*, and not as a piece of literature addressed to the aesthetic sense of the cultured. That may be considered a good sermon which makes those who hear it think soberly, and act righteously. That is a poor sermon which is admired only for its literary excellence; although literary excellence does not of itself detract from the merit and effectiveness of a sermon. As a sword is not less a sword, and is not less effective, because its blade is polished, so a sermon is not less a sermon and is not less effective as a sermon, because it exhibits high literary art. Strength and beauty, power and refinement are not necessarily strangers. As evidence of this, see the sermon on the Mount by Christ and that of Peter on the day of Pentecost. The new truths and profound thoughts of these model sermons are set forth in a style of literary excellence which satisfies every claim of literary criticism, and yet with a simplicity that meets every demand of the popular intelligence. We only insist that the test of the sermon is its effect on the popular mind, and that every sermon should be composed with the popular need and the popular capacity fully in view.

3. The sermon must be based on religious truth, and must be religious in its subject. It must recognize man as a religious being. It must discourse of subjects adapted to the wants and destiny of this religious being. This also implies that the spirit of the treatment should be religious. Without these characteristics the sermon may be useful as an oration, and may do good in removing popular ignorance, and in elevating the general standard of moral order, and in creating patriotic sentiment, but it cannot be a sermon in the sense that it *announces* and *teaches* and *enforces* the truth of God's Word with

reference to man as a religious being. It is this, its distinctively religious character and aim, which entitle it to be called a sermon, and which give it its right of appeal to the religious nature of those who hear it.

4. The sermon must contain truth revealed in the Christian Scriptures. It is not enough that the sermon is based on a text of Scripture merely, for a text is not absolutely necessary to a sermon, but above all, the sermon must expound, or illustrate some fact or principle or doctrine, or enforce some precept of the Divine Word. Not only must these be biblical, but the great mass of the materials must be taken from the Bible, and the spirit of the Bible must animate it. It dare go outside the Bible for illustrations and for any truths of history or science which may confirm the truth of the Bible, but these are not to form its subject matter, and its aim is not to expound or enforce these extra biblical truths. Besides, whatever truth comes into the sermon from without the Bible must be made to breathe the spirit of the Bible before it can be properly used in the sermon.

Professor Phelps says: "Only when Christianized in spirit and in form does the religion of nature become on any large scale the power of God unto salvation." The same may be said of any and all truth. That it can have no authority over the consciences of men, so as to command their obedience, until it shall have been shown to be in perfect harmony with revealed truth, is enforced by two facts. (a) The religion of nature and the truths of philosophy have not purified the human heart. The gods of the Greeks and Romans were little else than the human passions deified and worshipped. Philosophy refined the manners of the select few, but it did not appoint the worship of the true God, nor did it give assured hope of eternal life. Indeed the existence of one only divine mind, the Cause of all things, and the immortality of the human soul, were the dreams rather than the conclusions of Philosophy. (b) Preaching is peculiar to Christianity, which claims to be a revelation from God. Natural religion erects no pulpits and employs no heralds. Vinet says: "There is no Mohammedan



Church, nor Braminical ; and certainly there was no Church in the religion of Homer." Natural religion has a *cultus* and teaches some truths by symbols, but it has no preachers, no public heralds of religious truth, and no expounders of doctrines which touch the interrelations of God and man. It takes little or no account of man's capacity to know truth and to be influenced by it. Revelation recognizes man's faculty for truth, and seeks to influence him by the truth. It chooses the sermon as the instrumental bearer of the truth,—hence of its own truth.

But as this truth is not of man or by man, but from God, the sermon which is fully charged with revealed truth is a strong instrument for persuasion. Hence preaching and reformation, preaching and revivals, have always gone hand in hand. Also preaching and the study of the Bible have always been associated, as the study of the Bible has led to preaching and preaching in turn has led to the study of the Bible. Preaching is simply setting forth and expounding the truth of the Bible ; good preaching is setting forth and expounding these truths in such a way as to get the largest amount of revealed truth before the hearers. Hence the Bible must be the preacher's chief study. He must learn its doctrines and strive to catch its spirit.

5. A sermon is a discourse on revealed religious truth carefully elaborated. It is not enough for the sermon merely to state the truth. It must elaborate it and present it in its details and applications. This makes a sermon a work of art—it has its orderly parts, its beginning, middle and end, its proposition, proof and application. Hence the sermon dare not throw its materials together in any way, relying on the orthodoxy of its doctrine, or on the strength of its separate statements. It must also be solicitous about the collection of parts, and the proportionate treatment of each part. It must be constructed in full recognition of the laws of the human mind, which has a natural love of order, and which is never more offended than when publicly addressed in a disorderly and incoherent way. Hence the best effect in preaching can come from

a systematic arrangement of the several parts of a discourse, and from thoughtful adaptation of Scriptural truth to the condition and needs of the audience. Spontaneous efforts now and then may succeed; but spontaneous efforts that have been successful, have always been the result of previous careful training in thinking and speaking. Spontaneous preaching as a rule will no more succeed than spontaneous poetry. Both will be deficient in thought and arrangement. Great poets, historians, and orators have given much attention to the elaboration of their materials and to the details of their work. All good preachers carefully elaborate their materials, which means that they have arranged them in such order and in such proportions as to give the sermon the character of a work of art, but differing from a pure work of art in this, that it seeks to accomplish an end, and is not an end in itself.

By elaboration is meant further that in the sermon the truth is to be presented in its various forms and aspects. In a book it is sufficient often simply to enunciate the truth, or to exhibit it in a single phase, since the mind of the reader can pause long enough to elaborate it for himself. But in listening to preaching the mind of the hearer is hurried on from one point to another with such rapidity as to be unable to supply any deficiency. If it pauses to examine one thought it loses the next, and so on. Many valuable truths are lost in a sermon because they are not dwelt upon and turned from side to side and exhibited in different lights.

These five characteristics of a sermon, given above, should be brought distinctly before the mind of every preacher. He should know what a sermon is and what it is intended to accomplish before he attempts to compose and preach it. We give below the following "Requisites of a Sermon," condensed from the *Pastoral Theology* of the late Dr. Walther:

"The most important of all the official acts of every pastor is that of public preaching. To this he must consequently give the greatest diligence. The most important requisites of a sermon are the following:

1. It must contain nothing but *God's Word*, and that, too,

*pure and unadulterated*, (1 Peter 4; Acts 26 : 22; Romans 12 : 7; Jer. 33 : 28; 2 Tim. 2 : 15). 2. God's Word must be *correctly applied*, (2 Tim. 3 : 17); 3. The whole counsel of God concerning their salvation must be proclaimed to the hearers, (Acts 20 : 20, 26, 27). 4. The same must be adapted to the *special wants of the hearers*, (Luke 12 : 42; 1 Cor. 3 : 1, 2; Heb. 3 : 11; 6 2). 5. *It must be adapted to the time*, (Matt. 16 : 3). 6. *It must be well arranged*, Luke 1 : 3. And finally, 7. *It must not be too long*.

## OBSERVATION 1.

"If the preacher be ever so good a liturgist, or ever so well endowed with gifts for ruling a congregation, or for exercising the office of the private care of souls, yet all this can in no way supply the place of excellence in preaching. This is the chief means for the successful exercise of the holy office. 'Nothing,' says the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Art. 24, 'attaches the people to the Church more than good preaching.' So in the article of Confession : 'If you wish to attach the Church to you, you must try accordingly to teach and preach aright; thereby you can produce a good will and constant obedience.'

## OBSERVATION 2.

"A pastor cannot be guilty of any greater infidelity in his office, and through nothing else so change it to only the greater condemnation, than, by the neglect of the greatest diligence in reading, meditation and prayer, to fail to give his congregation the very best within his power. The fearful expression of the prophet, Jer. 48 : 10, 'cursed be he that doeth the Word of the Lord negligently,' applies above all to public preaching. Woe, therefore, to the preacher who, either from indolence or dislike of exertion or from fear of man, or from desire to please men, or from ambition, or because he 'consumes his time in other pursuits (as may occur from taste for other occupations, or avarice or ambition), does not form his sermon in accordance with his text, or in accordance with the wants of his hearers, but only so that he may consume a portion of an hour in

speaking, without any special preparation, upon what is easiest and thus perform this duty without trouble and exertion, or so that he may give the least offence, or may shine with the greatest brilliancy as a pulpit orator. The other occupations, through which a preacher must not allow himself to consume the time necessary for the preparation of his sermons, are such as farming, raising cattle, gardening, grape culture, music, painting, learned studies, authorship and other hobbies not to speak of other matters absolutely inconsistent with the office of a minister, such as hunting, fishing, visiting of drinking and other places of pleasure, mercantile occupations, political activity and the like."

ARTICLE X.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By Professor M. COOVER, D.D.

The science of comparative religions has taken into its province not only ethnic, but also universal religions. The tendency is to reduce all religious phenomena to a natural origin, and to trace from common sources the development of the religious consciousness and the varied forms of its expression. Scarcely any distinctive feature of Christianity has escaped parallelism with the phenomenology of nature-religions. The incarnation of the Son of God finds asserted parallels discoverable in every well-developed religion of primitive peoples. Without present discoverable connection between identical conceptions, it is said that East and West manifest elements of religion which indicate a common origin. The rise of these similar conceptions may be from the spontaneity of man's religious feelings in his observance and philosophy of nature without necessary connection with any racial type; or instead of spontaneity of many peoples the similarity may be due to the imaginative genius of some preëminent primitive race whose

religious phenomenology and mythical tenets have been transmitted by hidden but discoverable links through migrations of races and varied by differing religious temperaments.

In respect of the Incarnation a Western type of phenomena is discovered in the religion of ancient Mexico.

In sunny tropical climes where flowers were in luxuriant bloom and birds sang the joys of ceaseless happy rhythm, one heart of humankind was tremulous with the sad consciousness of man's sorrowful condition. Nature was perfect. Sights and sounds were in harmony with celestial beauty. Flowers and birds were in sympathy with heaven's perfectness, and man alone was vile.

At the foot of the Mountain of the Serpents, the sacred Mount Coatepec, lived the pious widow Coatlicue; a lonely widow she, but near to the gods in her life of grace and meditation. Coatlicue pondered the estate of evil as she sought the temple of the Sun to pay her vows of humble sacrifice. As she pursued the path amid the flowers that led to the sacred fane, there fluttered to her feet a tuft of brilliant feathers. She placed the treasure in her bosom for an offering to the Sun, and as she drew it forth within the holy temple, lo! she had conceived, and the humming-bird took on human form to be the savior of the Aztec nation.

Uitzilpochtli was born resplendent of hue barred in shades of azure blue upon his face, and legs, and arms. A plume of gorgeous feathers crowned his head, and rainbow-shaded humming-birds' feathers decked his agile left leg. Endowed with superhuman strength, while yet an infant, though grasping shield and lance, he slew all those who had derided his mother in her pregnant state, and bestowed upon her all their plundered property. After accomplishing feats of wondrous prodigy for the Aztec race, he reascended to heaven bearing his mother with him, and crowned her henceforth the goddess of flowers.

The humming-bird in the Aztec language means the "sun-beam," or the "sun's hair." As with us the swallow is the harbinger of spring, so among Mexicans the humming-bird is the prophet of summer.

Coatlicue is the female serpent, which is none other than the

spring florescence creeping over the face of the earth which embodies the life of restored nature. Man's sadness was not due to moral causes, but to physical conditions of a desert and barren earth. And nature made annual atonement for man's sad loss. The sun, the giver of life, calls nature back from the path of death, and reflecting his redeeming rays in the plumage of the humming-bird becomes the world's deliverer. The earth dead in winter, wrapt in the sere mantle of decay, pulseless to the dream of birds and flowers, is again visited by the sun which revives from death, and brings back the flowers and songs of birds, whose emblem of sure but evanescent beauty is the transiently elusive and resplendent humming-bird.

When we turn from Mexican mythology to the court of ancient Chau in China, we find the story of Lao-tsze, the "treasure-keeper," or the "keeper of the archives" in the house of royal records.

He was carried before his birth in the womb of his mother for seventy-two years, and according to other accounts, for eighty-one years. Hence he was called "Old Boy" or "Venerable Philosopher." Ethical precepts and practical philosophy constituted the elements of salvation for the Chinese. The "Venerable Philosopher" became the national deliverer and savior.

The sun-myths of Greece find their counterpart in the Aztec nation, and the Grecian wisdom-precepts as sources of salvation find a Chinese ancestry.

A Chinese antecedent of supernatural conception is claimed for Hau-chi whose mother chanced to tread upon a toe-print made by God, and in consequence was found with child, and in due time brought forth her illustrious son who became a national hero and deliverer.

More embellished and definite is the oriental myth of the birth of Siddartha, the illustrious Buddha.

"In this wise was the holy Buddha born.

Queen Maya stood at noon, her days fulfilled,

Under a palsa in the palace grounds,

A stately trunk, straight as a temple-shaft,

With crown of glossy leaves and fragrant blossoms;

And, knowing the time come—for all things knew—

The conscious tree bent down its boughs to make  
 A bower about Queen Maya's majesty,  
 And earth put forth a thousand sudden flowers  
 To spread a couch, while, ready for the bath,  
 The rock hard by gave out a limpid stream  
 Of crystal flow. So brought she forth her child  
 Painless—he having on his perfect form  
 The marks, thirty and two of blessed birth;  
 Of which the great news to the palace came."

After the royal birth follows the glorious pagentry of mingled but harmonious subjects of heaven and earth.

"But when they brought the painted palanquin  
 To fetch him home, the bearers of the poles  
 Were the four regents of the earth, come down  
 From Mount Sumeru—they who write men's deeds  
 On brazen plates—the angel of the East,  
 Whose hosts are clad in silver robes, and bear  
 Targets of pearl: the angel of the South,  
 Whose horsemen, the Kumbhandas, ride blue steeds,  
 With sapphire shields: the angel of the West,  
 By Nagas followed, riding steeds blood-red,  
 With coral shields: the angel of the North,  
 Environed by his Yakshas, all in gold,  
 On yellow horses, bearing shields of gold.  
 These with their pomp invisible, came down  
 And took the poles, in cast and outward garb  
 Like bearers, yet most mighty gods; and gods  
 Walked free with men that day, though men knew not:  
 For heaven was filled with gladness for earth's sake,  
 Knowing Lord Buddha thus was come again."

Regents take the place of Wise men from the East, and the king plays a different role from that of Herod; instead of secrecy with malign purpose, there is public proclamation and commanded deference.

"The king gave order that his town should keep  
 High festival; therefore the ways were swept,  
 Rose-odors sprinkled in the street, the trees  
 Were hung with lamps and flags, while merry crowds  
 Gaped on the sword-players and postures,  
 The jugglers, charmers, swingers, rope-walkers,  
 The nautch-girls in their spangled skirts and bells  
 That chime light laughter round their restless feet;  
 The masquers wrapped in skins of bear and deer,  
 The tiger-tamers, wrestlers, quail-fighters,  
 Beaters of drum and twanglers of wire,  
 Who made the people happy by command."

If there be any nature-myth in this poetic recital of India's deliverer, the physical antecedents have been lost in the embellishment of attempted history. It is a poetic recital with legend written large on the face of it, with legend which follows no nature-antecedents, but designed in fanciful detail to depict historic character and to posit a princely personality. It is replete with fancies, and environed by explicit fineness of accompaniment. The minutia of insignificant detail irrelevant to sane history or conceptual propriety, indicate the collected fancies of the poet.

Legend is not supposed to be psychologically accurate in rational accompaniments; poetry may in a measure transgress the reasonable in the flight of imagination and in exaggeration for emotional effect; but history must be psychologically true, else it is not history, but fiction. The story of Buddha is religious history in poetical dress. But religious history must undergo the test of moral examination. The ethical criterion must decide the quality of the supernatural as a ground of its probability.

Is it psychologically natural for human beings to face the supernatural, as in Buddha's history, with commonplace composure? With undisturbed equanimity the populace meets with superhuman events and personages. Who is not startled at the sudden appearance of the supernatural, especially when that power is personalized as angel, spirit, or regent god? It is psychologically true for shepherds to be sore afraid at a supernatural manifestation; but it is false to human character to confront supernatural prodigies, and join in dance and revelry with transports of happiness. If at any time the moral sense is quickened, it must be when man stands face to face with the spiritually astounding. But tiger-tamers, jugglers, and rope-walkers, "nautch-girls in their spangled skirts and bells, that chime light laughter round their restless feet," are no fit ethical accompaniments to the revelations of regent angels. It is not according to human nature to dance before celestial visitants, and be merry at the appearance of angel bands. But such is the manner of unreasoning fiction. The history of Jesus of Nazareth is true to human nature, and true to the manner of



the supernatural. It is credible by the verity of the circumstances, and their agreement with the action of human minds and sensibilities. It is not the product of superstition, for that partakes of vagary; it is not religious fancy, for that is more ecstatic; it is not legend, for that is incongruous with rational fact, and transgresses ethical propriety and purpose.

Confucianism has its prudent maxims; Buddhism its spirit-ecstasies; but the story of Christ's birth and infancy fits human nature in its psychological attitude of meeting what is divine, and in the ethical accompaniments necessary for a great salvable purpose.

The vagaries of legend, the superstitions of nature-religions, fade away before the peculiar halo that surrounds the person of a Jewish babe. It is the ethical radiance that dispels the gloaming in which are unappeased feelings after God; it is the perfect adaptability of Jesus' history to the moral consciousness of men that stamps the supernatural with credibility. Men may cease to seek for historic evidences of the divinity of Jesus, may cease to hunt for verifying demonstrations of the supernatural, and find the certitude scaled as sacred evidence in their own lives in the complete adaptation of the objective fact to their subjective as well as spiritual need. Let him who doubts the historic fact believe through the historic effect.

---

Principal Adeney in the *Biblical World* for December makes some significant statements relative to Jesus' self-testimony, and the sacrificial character of his death.

The personal authority of Jesus we not infrequently overlook, because his words and declarations are so self-evident that we do not pause to question them. Prophets who spoke peremptorily through a consciousness of the divineness of their message, and prefaced their deliverances by "Thus saith the Lord," were set aside without any apology by Jesus, who simply declares, "Verily I say unto you," not infrequently in controversion of specific prophetic statements.

While Jesus frankly confesses limitations to his knowledge, mark the claim of personal dignity in the statement in the ascending order, angel, Son, Father. "But of that day or that

hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

In the parable of the Vineyard where the servants maltreated are the prophets, Jesus in calm self-consciousness refers to his own exalted relation to God, the owner of the vineyard, who "had yet one, a beloved son; he set him last unto them, saying, They will reverence my son." In the parable of the Sheep and the Goats Jesus himself is the judge before whom all nations are gathered.

The gospel must be torn to shreds to eliminate the divine dignity and exalted position of Jesus.

If we demur at Jesus' self-valuation as indelicate assumptions of what should come from other sources for modest and adequate evidence, we pause before the sanity of his teaching and the "sweet reasonableness" of the manner of one that never speaks or thinks of himself for his own sake, but in lowliness and self-abandonment spontaneously seeks the welfare of others.

From the constituent elements of Jesus' sanity and profound self-consciousness is his teaching concerning the character of his death as a ransom. In view of the definite statements which he makes when the occasions open the door to this necessary presentation of his ministry, and in his declarations when he institutes his sacrament at the supper, the significance of his death as a sacrifice for the remission of sins, and as a ransom for the world, cannot be set aside.

The synoptists and Paul are in full harmony with the express statements of Jesus himself in their deliverance on this momentous theme.

Dr. Adeney says: "In view of all this, we cannot escape from the idea that Jesus here teaches the sacrificial character of his death.

"In the present day some people fight shy of all references to the blood of Christ, no doubt partly because they revolt against crude, gross references to the subject. Let them note this significant statement. I do not know that I have met with it before; but I venture to throw it out as beyond question: Since our Lord's reference to his blood as thus essential to our re-

demption is contained in all three synoptics, in one of Paul's most certainly authentic epistles—our oldest and best sources of primitive Christianity—and also reflected in John 6 : 53, it is *the very best authenticated of all our Lord's teachings*"

## II. GERMAN.

BY PROFESSOR S. GRING HEFELBOWER, D.D.

It is often claimed that the problems of Biblical Introduction have so overshadowed Dogmatics and Christian Ethics in the theological thought of the Fatherland, that the last named branches receive small attention compared with that which was given them in a former generation. But this is true of theological Ethics, only with marked limitations; for, though the students in this field have labored to a great extent without the inspiration of controversy, recent decades have witnessed an increase rather than a decrease in interest in the subject.

During the closing decades of the last century the most important works of the previous generation were published in new editions (Harless, Martensen, Wuttke), the lectures of a number of prominent theologians were given to the public (Vilmar, Beck, Kuebel, Dorner, V. Hofmann), and both Koestlin and Luthardt closed their life's work by publishing books on Christian Ethics. Luthardt had already placed the theological world under lasting obligations to him by his *History of Christian Ethics*. V. Ottingen published his *Ethics* in '73 and Frank his great work on the same subject in the middle of the 80's. Along side of this there were a number of smaller works, such as the section on Ethics in Kaehler's published outlines for his classes, and in a small book by Pfeleiderer. The 20th century had scarcely opened when Stange published his *Introduction to Ethics*, which has opened up perhaps more problems than any other recent publication. Hermann gave his *Ethics* to the public in 1901, which is scarcely anything else than an attempt to weave in a uniform system Christian Ethics and the Ethics of Kant; and soon afterward Haering, from a somewhat similar viewpoint, published his booklet on Ethics, which, in spite of its size, is adjudged by many to be of cardinal importance.

It is apparent that we have considerable material on the subject, but Hermann's work is really scarcely anything more than introduction along the lines already indicated. Haering is brief and popular. Luthardt's book was not a system, but a compendium. And Koestlin's work has had comparatively little influence. However, the great system of Frank remains as a master work unto the present day, and the fundamental principles on which he built up that system give it permanent value, because they enable him to present the whole of Christian Ethics with practically no limitations arising from the author's philosophical system. However, to assert that his work now after 20 years needs practically no supplementing or adjustment to the changed conditions in the world of thought, would be utterly false. In fact even his friends have frequently complained that he did not make sufficient use of historical and Biblical material, and entered into no discussion of viewpoints that he considered false. You cannot arm yourself with Frank to meet his assailants.

Strange as it may seem, from Heidelberg University, whose present theological reputation depends largely upon the fact that Troeltsch, who has been called the dogmatician of the *Religions-Geschichtliche Methods*, lives and teaches there, has come a work which is judged by some to be a most important book. A few months ago Prof. Ludwig Lemme published the first volume of his *Christliche Ethik*. He places himself in the direct line of descendance from Schleiermacher, Rothe, Schmid, Martensen and Frank, and seems to feel that one of the chief problems which has to be met is the Kantian philosophical Ethics, against which he directs most of his polemics.

The present volume contains parts 1 and 2. The first part is again divided into two chief divisions—"The natural moral capacity as it is presupposed and always present in Christian Ethics" and "The particularly Christian moral capacity of man." He rejects directly the referring of all moral activity to the will as a faculty; the sensibilities and the intellect also take part in all moral activity. But, though the will is neither the seat nor the source of moral action, it is nevertheless absolutely necessary for all ethical activity, for neither the formu-

lation of the fundamental principles of Ethics nor the entering upon an ethically correct course of life is possible without it.

The second chief subdivision, which treats of the Christian ethical capacity of man, brings in much material from dogmatics, such as divine revelation, the incapacity of the natural man, faith in its double quality as the receptive organ for religious truth and a moral motive power, the Kingdom of God, Christ as our example, which are regarded from ethical viewpoints. When he presents the Kingdom of God as the goal and greatest good of life, he discusses in a very instructive way the formula of Kant that a man should do good for the sake of good, which he declares to be false.

The second chief division which discusses "The growth of the Christian-Ethical personality," is in five divisions. 1. The necessity of this growth. 2. The hindrances of ethical growth (the Christian teaching concerning evil). 3. The means of sustaining moral growth. 4. The manner of growth. 5. The crowning points of growth. In discussing the first subdivision mentioned, we are surprised to note that regeneration is treated only as a higher stage of sanctification and as conditioned by the development of the individual. He counts among the evils not only the attacks and temptations but also illusions, such as the craze of sinlessness and of special inspiration. Among the means for supporting the moral growth, not only the Word and Sacraments, but also the congregations, devotions, labor and prayer. Christian personality in its perfected condition is the crown of this moral growth, and in this section he naturally discusses Christian perfection.

Of course those whose ethical conceptions are dominated by the social viewpoint will not be satisfied with Prof. Lemme's method of treatment, yet they are disarmed to a great extent by his conception of personality, which does not regard it as the opposite of society. On the contrary, he proves how the personality by virtue of its social conscience stands in close relation with society. Thus his ethics has the advantage of fusing the social and the personal character of Christian Ethics into a unity because of its fundamental principle.

The method that he follows in presenting his material is the

descriptive or empiric-psychological, which, according to the author, is the only adequate form for Christian Ethics. Lemme bases the obligatory character of his system upon the claim that the life of faith rest upon an unconditioned "ought," and is directed by an imminent norm, and consequently because of this very fact becomes normative, and because it discovers the difference between that which should be and that which is, it becomes imperative.

In applying this descriptive method he gathers material not only from the present, but also from the past; and these historical citations, as well as the free use of the New Testament, makes his book a reference work in many respects.

In his preface he proposes to draw a sharp dividing line between that which is ethical and that which is intellectual, religious, aesthetic, juristic or sociological, and, according to his reviewers, he has succeeded. The peculiarity of that which is specifically ethical appears in clearest outline; and, though at times that which is peculiar in the ethical life may seem to be only of obligatory character, the teleological element is plainly seen, and the highest good is the Kingdom of God. The old conceptions of good, virtue and duty which are still to be noted in Frank are not all prominent in this work, and in this is to be noted a marked step forward. Lemme also acknowledges that all ethics, even Christian ethics, is in a certain sense eudaemonistic, if a person understands thereby the interest of the ego in the religious-moral worth of personality. The foolish assertion of many students of ethics, that the essence of true morality consists in being independent of the ego, has often held the science up to scorn. The task of ethics is rather to draw a sharp line between that which is moral and an immoral egoism.

In February of 1903 Prof. Kunze delivered an address before the Chemnitz Conference on *The Eternal Divinity of Jesus Christ*, which the conference requested him to publish. It appeared about one year later rewritten and enlarged. When we remember that Kunze is a disciple of Thomasius and Luthardt, and that he is generally regarded as one of the most conservative dogmaticians of the present day in Germany, his avowed and actual deviation from the traditionally orthodox establish-

ment and statement of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and the evident influence that the Schleiermacher-Ritschlian method of considering this doctrine has with him, it is evident that this pamphlet deserves more than a mere passing notice.

After a brief introduction and discussion and rejection of the Ritschlian conception of Christ's divinity as held by such Ritschlians as H. Schultz and Kaftan, he raises the question: "How do we come to ascribe divinity to Christ?" He is not satisfied to establish Christ's divinity merely on Scripture passages; for as long as we derive the religious conviction of the divinity of Christ from biblical citations alone, this conviction is too externally mediated and it does not have the firm foundation that faith requires; we can believe in Christ only for Christ's sake. Ritschl's own theory, which is characterized by the expression "judgments of value" (*Werturteile*) is only a subterfuge which dodges the real difficulty. For if my faith is the recognition of the divinity of Christ, His divinity is first of all the begetting cause and the sustaining foundation of my faith. Our faith affirms only a divinity which, independant of it as existing, has proven itself before and continues to do so. Kunze likewise rejects the method of those who establish the value of Christ on the workings that we experience from Him. The works of Christ on us are conditioned on that which He is and accordingly that which we consider Him to be. "The divinity of Christ depends on that which He makes out of Himself, upon that which He is and desires to be, yet that which He is in such a way that it is known to us in Him." Consequently the question concerns, on the one hand, the claim that Jesus made, and, on the other, it concerns a reality which supports and establishes that claim.

Accordingly Kunze analyzes the self-revelation of Christ in the Word and in the working of Jesus. He starts with the Synoptics, but also uses the fourth gospel and claims that, with the exception of Christ's preexistence, it does not go beyond the others in predicating divine attributes of Him. The divinity thus established is compatible with full humanity. We do not assert this as if we applied to Jesus a previously formulated canon concerning the general relation of His divinity and



humanity, but we predicate this concerning Him just because we have experienced it in Him. On the basis of scripture Kunze seeks to prove that Christ's humanity does not exist independent of and yet alongside of His divinity, but that it is ever mediated through the human, and that the latter always appears as the vessel for the infinite content; accordingly His incarnation is an act of His divine power and love. His preexistence and wonderful birth are not two fundamentally exclusive and contradictory theories invented to explain the religious peculiarity of the man Jesus, much rather do they require and mutually condition each other. The miracle of His death corresponds to the miracle of His birth, consequently every logical system assumes the same attitude to the events of Christmas and Easter. Christ's divinity is proved also by His activity included between these termini. The crowning point of the gospel proof of His divinity is the story of the passion. Only His divine sonship enabled and justified the man Jesus to represent man before God and to take on Himself the burden of the sins of the world.

In the closing pages Kunze proves that the absoluteness of the Christian religion hinges upon our recognition of the eternal essential divinity of Christ.

The publication of this pamphlet is intended by Kunze and the Chemnitz Conference, which requested it, to show that confessional clergy and theologians are not opposed to a further development of the dogma, if only its religious content remains. In fact by his avowed dissatisfaction with many things connected with the traditional orthodox establishment and statement of the doctrine, Kunze wishes to announce to the theological world, and in this the conference also concurs, that he cannot think this cardinal doctrine of orthodox protestantism in the thought forms of a previous age. In fact he does not hesitate to criticise the statement of the problem, the method and even some of the results of old protestant orthodoxy. And the modern kenotists are charged with "ever more and more trimming, abbreviating and weakening the doctrine of the divinity of the incarnate Lord."

Though Kunze's results, so far as the religious content of the



doctrine of the divinity of Christ is concerned, are practically the same as those with which we have ever been familiar, his method proves that even a conservative theologian reveals the influence of the Schleiermacher-Ritschlian method, even though he does not think Ritschl's thoughts and finds it necessary to disagree with him in almost all of the cardinal truths of the Christian religion. If we are not mistaken this pamphlet is more than a discussion of its theme, it is a symptom of the times in Germany. However, Kunze is not becoming Ritschlian. This is proven by the severe criticisms that such men as Lobstein (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*) and Titius (*Theologische Rundschau*) have made both of his methods and results, though of course the latter were more objectionable to them than the former. They recognize his effort to formulate and establish the dogmas of the Church without the Scholasticism of past centuries, but they are also thoroughly convinced that any attempt to accomplish this that falls short of their own methods and results will be unscientific,—according to their way of thinking.

## ARTICLE XI.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*The High Rock.* Sermons, Addresses and Articles by Edmund Jacob Wolf, D.D., L.L. D., Late Professor of Church History and New Testament Exegesis in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa. Memorial Edition. Compiled by Committee of the Board of Publication. Including also "Dr. Wolf from the Home Side," by Robbin B. Wolf, Esq., and "Dr. Wolf in the Lutheran Church," by Rev. W. E. Parson, D.D. With portrait. Cloth, gilt top. 379 pages. Price, \$1.50.

Dr. Wolf's many friends will welcome the appearance of this memorial volume. The biographical part of it is necessarily brief; but furnishes a faithful picture of Dr. Wolf as we knew him who frequently sat at his table and abode under his hospitable roof. His work in and for the Lutheran Church is briefly indicated in its salient features. The body of the book contains ten sermons and seventeen articles and addresses. These have been carefully chosen as typical of Dr. Wolf's Scriptural preaching, his wide and vigorous thought and his profound interest in the affairs and questions of the day. These specimens of his pulpit and literary work need no comment, for Dr. Wolf will be best remembered as a teaching preacher. The Board has done well to preserve something of his handiwork for coming generations in the Church. The book is not a commercial venture and should need no advertisements.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

*Text-Book of the History of Doctrines.* By Dr. Reinhold Seeberg, Professor of Theology in Ordinary, in Berlin. Revised, 1904, by the author. Translated by Charles E. Hay, D.D. Complete in two volumes. Price \$4.00.

This book is a valuable addition to scientific theology, and as such we welcome it in the English language. It fills a vacant place, and may be read and studied with profit. It does not have the compactness of Loofs, nor the fulness of Hagenbach, nor the brilliancy of Harnack, nor the geniality of Thomasius, nor the learning of Münscher (von Coeln). But it is written in strong, clear style, and for the most part its materials seem to have been gathered by an original study of the sources. It also constantly notes the places in the originals from which information has been gained and quotations have been made. It thus serves as a guide for further and independent study of the subjects. As a text-book it can be used profitably by a teacher who will make it the basis of lectures and discussions. But students who have

to recite from it in the usual way of reciting are sure to pronounce it "tough," and are not likely to get, through it, a clear and connected idea of the history of the Christian doctrines.

The book is written from a thoroughly Protestant, and, in the main, from the Lutheran standpoint, but neither the Protestantism nor the Lutheranism of the author has betrayed him into dogmatic and denominational partiality. He has aimed at objectivity in the representations he gives of Catholics, Zwinglians and Calvinists. He recognizes the fact that on Protestant territory the fallibility of Dogma must be acknowledged as an axiom, and that every age must preserve its own version of the History of Doctrines, since our conceptions of the past are always conditioned by the conceptions of the present. Hence the History of Doctrines is not a fixed conception.

The introductions, which cover more than thirty pages, are taken up with definitions, and matters pertaining to Literature, Heathenism, Judaism and other necessary preliminary subjects.

The discussions on Early Christianity, the Christological controversies, the heresies, the conduct and decrees of councils, are especially full, but they do not exhibit anything new. We doubt whether the author has done full justice to the facts relating to the influence which Greek philosophy exerted on the organization of the Church and on the shaping of the decrees of synods and councils. Here we think that both Hatch and Harnack are the more correct and reliable.

The section on the "divergencies of the Eastern and Western Church," prior to Augustine, though brief, is comprehensive. These divergencies in the main are connected with anthropology, and more particularly with the problem of free-will. The Greeks, as is ethnologically natural, gave greater prominence to the intellect. The Romans lay the greater stress on the Will, and also on grace. But neither Greeks nor Romans knew anything about the "alone-activity" of grace. Speaking of Ambrose in this connection our author says: "It is easily seen that this forerunner of Augustine was not unacquainted with Paul. We find in him, it is true, a certain synergism. But while the Eastern theologians represent man as making the beginning for the attainment of salvation, and then ascribe a *synergia* to God, here it is God who begins the work, and the *synergia* is upon the part of man. The Eastern Teachers think of a divine, the Western of a human synergy." Vol. I., p. 331.

This we regard as a just discrimination.

Naturally our author gives much space to the discussion of the views and controversies of Augustine. Without question this great African father subtends a larger arc on the Christian horizon than any other theologian from Paul to Luther. We may say that he was a man of two souls, the one Catholic and the other Protestant. Hence we are not surprised to hear our author speak of "the multitude of in-

consistencies and self-contradictory tendencies in his teachings." Vol. I., p. 367. With this we thoroughly agree, as we also agree with what Dr. John Hunt says of this same Augustine, viz., that his language was "never logical, always exaggerated, and often inconsistent with itself." *Religious Thought of England*, Vol. I., p. 16. "And yet," as Seeberg says, "the ideas of this man furnished the themes for the piety and theology of more than a thousand years." Vol. I., p. 368. Without doubt the entire ecclesiastical and sacramental system of the Roman Catholic Church, is based on Augustine's conception of the Church as an organism, and on his doctrine of the sacraments, which imprint *character indelebilis* on the recipient. His doctrine of sin and grace laid the foundation for the theology of the Reformation. Hence at the same time Augustine was the patron theologian of Rome and of Wittenberg, and each fought the other over his shoulders.

All in all we commend Seeberg's exhibition of Augustine's doctrine of sin, grace, predestination, free-will. No two students of Augustine's works will interpret him alike, and that chiefly because of his exaggerated language and his multitude of inconsistencies. Our author thinks that his influence in the Church is explained by his "wonderful power of assimilating and glorifying." Vol. I., p. 367. Rather would we say that his influence is explained by his profound thought and by the intensity of his convictions and by the fervor of his piety. He was an epoch-making man and belongs to the entire Church. Hence he must be studied in order that we may understand the theology of the Reformation and also that of our own times. We must study him in order to avoid his pessimistic anthropology, his monergistic predestinarianism, his hierarchism, asceticism, sacramentalism, worship of saints, veneration of relics and other unevangelical doctrines and practices. The book before us will serve as a guide here, but it can do no more.

We turn now to volume II. of this *Text-Book*.

Here the first 217 pages are occupied with an account of Dogma and with the movement of theological thought from the seventh century to the close of the Middle Ages, including a brief account of the *Renaissance*.

Scholasticism is not as clearly defined as it ought to be, and the relation of Aristotle to the same ought to have been more fully stated; neither has the author adequately discussed *Realism* and *Nominalism*. He has taken too much for granted by the reader. But the discussion of Anselm's, *Cur Deus Homo* and of Peter Lombard's *Quatuor Libri Sententiarum* is quite as satisfactory as the space would seem to allow. He regards Anselm's book as based on the German legal maxim: *Punishment or Satisfaction*. More correctly, we think, has Stevens defined the Anselmic theory as "feudal"—"an interpretation based on the ideas of mediaeval chivalry." *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 241.

Our author aptly characterizes the *Sententiae* of Peter as "a great collection of citations from the Fathers," p. 62. Yet "it is dominated by the *ratio* and the dialectic method." It was certainly the most influential theological work of the Middle Ages. It summarizes the results of previous theological thinking and fixes for the Roman Catholic Church the number and the doctrine of the sacraments. A good characterization of Thomas Aquinas, and a good analysis of his great work, the *Summa*, appear on pp. 99 *et seqq.* Duns Scotus, William of Occam and Gabriel Biel come in for a good share of consideration; but in a Text-Book we should expect less detail and the omission of the names of men who are merely the satellites of the real thinkers of the Mediaeval Period.

Book III., Vol. II., pp. 221-466, is devoted to the "further development of doctrine through the Reformation and the fixation of the doctrines of Catholicism." This section opens with "the views of Luther," to whom eighty-four pages are given. Here our author shows himself at his best. No one can resist the conclusion that he has made an original and comprehensive study of the theology of "the wonder-worker of modern times, *Martin Luther*." The genesis of Luther's theological views is traced historically and chronologically. The famous *De Servo Arbitrio* is admirably sketched on pp. 244-6. It may surprise some persons not a little to read: "Everything is the work of God, even the fall of Cain, although Luther does not enter upon the question of the genesis of evil in the world. From this follows, as a logical consequence, the absolute double *Predestination* and the subjugation of the free will: With this thunderbolt he hurls down and crushes the free will to its foundations." His views are Scotist and deterministic; but they do not enter genetically into Luther's theology. They are subordinate to the central purpose viz., the magnifying of Christ and of his grace. Hence Predestination never assumed a genetic and principiant place in the theology of Luther, nor in that of the Lutheran Church.

Naturally we may expect to find in Luther—a man of intense conviction, of fervid imagination, and a "rhetorician," as he describes himself—"a multitude of inconsistencies and self-contradictory tendencies," but he is consistent with a growing intensity on the central and fundamental things: Faith, grace, good works, the means of grace, the Church as the congregation of saints. These subjects as conceived and treated by Luther constitute the Lutheran system and differentiates it from the Roman Catholic and Calvinistic systems. Hence there is such a thing as a Lutheran theology, a Lutheran method of conceiving and applying the content of a certain book called *via eminentiae* THE BIBLE. And we agree fully with our author when he declares, p. 334, "that the Augsburg Confession affords a clear, compact

and through presentation of the views of Luther in their fundamental features."

He who cannot find time to study Köstlin's *Luther's Theology* will do well to give days and nights to Seeberg's presentation.

But we regret that we cannot speak in terms of high praise of our author's *Theology of Melancthon*, pp. 347-362. Here the "good Homer" must have slept. He seems to have dipped into Melancthon, now and then, and not to have 'drunk deep from the Pierian spring.' On p. 349 he speaks of the "three causes of conversion: the Word, the Holy Spirit and the human will," and says that Melancthon expresses himself most plainly upon this point in the third revision of the *Loci* (A. D. 1543). Now as a matter of fact in the edition of 1543-4 (there is no edition of 1543) Melancthon expresses himself "upon this point," *verbatim et literatim* as he had done in the edition of 1535. Moreover, our author has not quoted Melancthon fairly. He should have written it thus: "The will not absolutely inactive, but resisting its own infirmity." "His inner motive is opposition to the Stoic *anagke*" (fate). But not more so in one of these editions than in the other. "Man yet retains freedom as a power of applying himself to grace (*facultas applicandi se ad gratiam*)." This definition does not appear in the edition of 1543-3 and when used in the edition of 1548, it was not meant to favor the Romanists, but to refute the Manichaeans and Fanatics, and was intended to be applied to the will renewed by grace, to the *voluntas renata*, as Melancthon declared, and so all candid historians from Selnecker down to Herrlinger (1878) report. Moreover, in the editions of the Reformation time this definition was printed in immediate connection with and as an explanation of the three preceding lines, and not as it is in the C. R., as the beginning of a new paragraph. How could Professor Seeberg have committed such a blunder? By following the Flacianist traditions, we should say: "Accordingly, by conversion God stirs the heart through the Word read or heard, and the heart then, by virtue of a certain freedom yet left to it, decides for or against God." Such is not "the theology of Melancthon:" "By virtue of a certain freedom yet left to it." In the editions named by Professor Seeberg and in all the editions of the third period (1543-1559) Melancthon declares that "the human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to work the spiritual work which God requires, the true fear of God, true faith," etc. It is the reiterated teaching of Melancthon that the will can decide for God only when potentiated by divine grace. How often does he write: *Præcedente gratia, comitante voluntate*, and "when the Holy Spirit assists, the mind tries to assent, and the will is not inactive?" The *initiative* is from God through the Word. "Without the Holy Spirit corrupt nature is not able to conceive the spiritual affections which God approves." Melancthon never uses language that can be rationally interpreted as Professor Seeberg has interpreted.

And equally inexact and unjust is our author when he says of Strigel,

p. 368, note that "he was unable to ascribe the ground and beginning of conversion absolutely to God." Has Dr. Seeberg never read Strigel's *Declaration* quoted in full in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for Oct. 1905, pp. 456 *et seq.*, nor his *Loci, Pars Prima*, pp. 368 *et seq.*, where the ground and beginning of conversion are ascribed to God absolutely, and where it is asserted "that beyond all doubt, and beyond all controversy the power to believe is the gift of the Holy Spirit?"

It is very inadequate to limit the history of *The Synergistic Controversy* to a few extracts from the *Weimar Disputation*, which constitutes a very small part of the literature of the subject. It is certainly unfair to Melancthon and untrue to the facts for our author to say that "Melancthon gradually lost confidence in Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper," p. 350. He lost confidence in some of the crass and extreme statements of Luther in regard to the Lord's Supper, but not in that which is essential to the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as that doctrine had been set forth in both Wittenberg Concords of 1536, and elsewhere.

Very unsatisfactory also is the representation concerning the Form of Concord. We are left almost entirely in the dark in regard to its theological antecedents, and absolutely so in regard to the methods pursued to obtain the endorsement of the Flacianists, and of the manner in which it was introduced into some of the Churches, for not less than twenty-two Lutheran principalities and cities declined to accept it. It is altogether a question as to how far "it is based on the fundamental symbols of the Lutheran Church." It were better to say that the authors make such a claim for it; and "that it actually gave expression to a consensus already existing" is contradicted by the fact that so many principalities refused to accept it, and by the fact that it has never had the consensus of the Lutheran Church; and it is very far from being a fact that "it gradually restored the peace of the Church." That its history has been a history of warfare no man can truthfully deny. And what shall we say of this affirmation: "The detailed theological definitions of the pure doctrine which it presented were in keeping with the spirit that had prevailed in the Church it represented for about a century and a half?" The Form of Concord is supposed to represent the Lutheran Church, which certainly had not existed "a century and a half" in 1580.

On the supposition that the translation is a correct rendering of the original (which in this case we are disposed to call in question), we say unhesitatingly that the first nine lines of the second paragraph on p. 382 make affirmations that are one-sided, partial and misleading.

But our author has succeeded far better in his representation of the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, pp. 332 *et seq.* Here the chief facts are accurately given, and the synopsis, though brief, is excellent. It will surprise some people to read the following: "The Confutators interpreted Article X. in the sense of transubstantiation, and Melancthon, so far from contradicting them, even introduced into the Apology a citation containing the expression 'changed (*mutari*) into flesh.'"

And this: "As the Confession places Article XIII., on the use of the Sacraments, after the discussion of baptism, the Lord's Supper and repentance, it is evident that it recognizes three sacraments (See Apology, p. 202, 4)." We may add that these conclusions are shared by all candid historians and expounders of the two symbols named. They certainly bear heavily on those who declare that "they (the Confessions) must be accepted in every statement of doctrine, in their own true, native original and only sense," and that those "who subscribe them must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense."

The Schmalkald Articles enumerate two sacraments, and reject Transubstantiation as a "subtle sophistry." How then are the earlier and later symbols to be harmonized?

Our author writes intelligently, sympathetically and generous about Zwingli and his system, though we think he does not adequately recognize the significance of Zwingli's doctrine of predestination as a determining factor in his system. The characterization of Calvin, given on p. 394, is just and discriminating. The sketch of "the theology of Calvin" is comprehensive, but it does not create the impression that the author has made a very thorough study of Calvinism. We certainly differ from him when he says, in opposition to Schweizer, p. 407, that Predestination is not Calvin's "central dogma." He seems to overlook the fact that Calvin affirmed that election, which is only the mercy side of Predestination, is "our first fundamental principle," and that in his *Articuli de Praedestinatione* he declares as the first article: "Before the first man was created God had determined by an eternal decree what should take place in regard to the entire human race." Christ, faith, justification, are all postponed to the Double Predestination, and are explained in adjustment to the eternal decree.

We close our notice of this book by calling attention to two matters that are purely formal: 1. The translator has executed his task (in this case an exceedingly difficult one) with conscientious fidelity. The English is everywhere idiomatic. Sometimes he has transfused rather than translated the original. Of the general accuracy of his renditions of the German there will scarcely be a difference of opinion. We call attention to inaccuracy of translation in the following instances: (a.) Vol. I., p. 322: *Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum* should be rendered: "The word comes to the element and a sacrament is formed" "Fit" is passive, and "it" has no grammatical antecedent. It would be absurd to say that either the word or the element becomes a sacrament. (b.) Vol. II., p. 356 (twice): *Credo remissionem peccatorum*: "I believe (not I believe in) the remission of sins." In the Apostles' Creed the preposition *in* is not to be applied to the articles that follow *Spiritum Sanctum*. Since the Christian does not believe *in*, but believes "the Holy Catholic Church is,"



and so with all the remaining articles. (c) Vol. II., p. 334: "Gentle Stepper" is altogether too *gentle* as a translation of *Leisetreterin*. The translation does by no means represent what Luther intended when he called the Confession *Apologia-Leisetreterin*. See the standard dictionaries *sub voce*.

2. The printing of the work is cramped and pinched. Both the words and the lines ought to have been more generously leaded. Printed as the *International Theological Library* is printed, these volumes would commend themselves to a wider circle of readers. Doubtless such a dress would have placed the work at \$5.00 instead of \$4.00. But eyesight is of more account to the reader, and especially to the theological student, than money.

J. W. RICHARD.

CHAS. SCRIBNERSSONS, NEW YORK.

*God's Choice of Men, a Study of Scripture.* By William R. Richards.

Has God any favorites among men? What sort of men are they? Why are they chosen? The man who has an interest in these questions will do well to read this fresh and stimulating book. Here is no stiff doctrine of election upon which a Lutheran might sharpen his logic, but a clear persuasive presentation and appeal that will awaken men to the dignity and duty of life. "I think that a hearty belief in the doctrine of election," writes Dr. Richards, "as it is taught in Scripture will supply the very elements of character needed to meet the peculiar moral perils of our age, enabling the men of our day to play the same manly part that was played by the old Calvinists in the days of the Reformation." And, we may add, by the old Lutherans, whose modern descendants will find themselves in hearty agreement with such a doctrine of election as is taught in this interesting volume.

One of the finest things in this book is the comparison of Jacob with Esau. It is sympathetic and it is modern. These men are types of those found in every society. The steady Jacob, single of purpose, tenacious of every advantage; the unstable Esau, wayward, capricious, are most vividly drawn. The attitude of the two towards life is shown in one sentence. "The birthright represented the highest things these two boys knew about, and while Esau despised it, Jacob set his heart on having it." And the obvious principle there illustrated is thus expressed. "When any child or man sets his heart on having the highest thing he knows about, and is willing to toil and wait and suffer and go hungry and cold—anything rather than lose it—he may not know much about high things yet, and there may still be many mean streaks left in his character, but it seems to me he has got his face turned toward being a Christian."

Everywhere in this volume one runs across flashes of light that illumine obscure passages of Scripture. And the wonderful way in

which the old truths and incidents are brought to bear upon our modern life will be most suggestive to the preacher and prophet of today. His kindly way of dealing with frailties and his hopeful, inspiring words for the despairing, his spur to the indolent, the quick jerk of his thought which brings the wayward into the road, the high purpose which fires the heroic soul, all these are done with skill and kindliness. The reading of a simple straightforward book like this makes one satisfied with the deep and high things of life, causes one to seek again the real sources of a strong nature, and under the touch of manifest sincerity in these refreshing pages, sends a man out into life with a singing of gladness in his heart.

D. W. WOODS, JR.

*The Spirit of Christmas.* By Henry Van Dyke.

One of the most beautiful books of the Christmas season was "The Spirit of Christmas," and because the holidays are over is no reason for thinking that it is no longer timely. It is a book appropriate to any day in the year, for its lessons, if learned, are those that will make every day a song. Dr. Van Dyke's style is so familiar to the host of readers with whom he has become popular that they will anticipate at once how beautifully he will write of Christmas and they will not be disappointed. The book is divided into "A Dream Story;" "Christmas-Giving and Christmas-Living;" "Keeping Christmas;" "A Christmas Prayer for the Home," and "A Christmas Prayer for 'Lonely Folks.'"

*The Christian Doctrine of Salvation.* By George Barker Stevens, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University.

This book belongs to *The International Theological Library* series of Text-Books edited by Drs. Briggs and Salmond. Of the series as a whole it were superfluous to speak, inasmuch as quite a number of the volumes have been for years known to the theological public. As was to be expected the volume before us bears the familiar family features of its predecessors: It moves on the line of the so-called liberal theology; it is critical towards the older theological systems and theories; it exhibits ample learning, and is written with decided ability.

The reader of this notice will get a more correct idea of the contents of this book, we think, if we should describe it as a treatise on the Atonement, for the major part of the book, as we interpret it, is occupied with criticisms of the older theories of the Atonement and with the establishment and vindication of the author's "own judgments" on the significance of the sufferings and death of Christ in their relation both to God and to man.

The method pursued by the author is critical and inductive, and he endeavors to test all "opinions by the fundamental Christian concepts of

God and of man." This, undoubtedly, is the only rational way to write a book on the Christian doctrine of salvation. Unfortunately, however, men do not all view history from the same standpoint, and the concepts which Christian theologians have of God and of man, are likely to be determined more or less by the reigning philosophy, and by their own personal experiences.

Part I, pp. 1-135, is devoted to a discussion of *The Biblical Basis of the Doctrine*. Here the Old Testament system of sacrifice, the prophetic doctrine, the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics, the Pauline doctrine, that of the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of John, are passed under review with critical examination. That different expositors have reached widely divergent conclusions in studying the sources and particularly the New Testament, can be accounted for, the author thinks, "partly, no doubt, because of the different presuppositions which they have brought to their study, and partly because the subject is variously represented and illustrated in the New Testament, and every interpreter may find something there to encourage his favorite mode of thought. The mind which thinks in terms of animal sacrifice will find a congenial representation in Hebrews. The thinker of the Roman, legal cast will hear his favorite keynote in Paul's idea of a satisfaction to law, meeting the ends of penalty, while the mystic will find ample material in the same apostle's conception of the ethical death to sin on Christ's cross and in John's doctrine of the 'propitiation' which is a moral cleansing provided and wrought by divine love." Pp. 122-3.

True, no doubt, but the fact suggests at least two things: (1.) Less dogmatizing on the part of expositors. (2.) The need of a theory of the Atonement based on *all* the facts, and hence made broad enough in its generalization to include all these scriptural conceptions, since it may be regarded as certain that not one of them comprehends all the truth in the premises; and it can be hardly questioned that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Paul, and John, had each his own characteristic conception of the significance of the sufferings and death of Christ.

In Part II, the author discusses *The Principal Forms of the Doctrine*. Here *The Commercial Theology of Anselm*, *The Governmental Theology of Grotius*, and *The Modern Penal Satisfaction Theories*, are stated with clearness and fairness, and are demolished in fine style. These theories are all *a priori*, and are not, in our judgment, based on the proper "Christian conception of God and of man." According to our author's interpretation of the first, "sin is *laese majestas*, an offense against the sacred person, the sovereign," or it is "an affront to infinite honor and majesty." Man *owes* debt. God alone can pay it. Very properly has this theory been called the *quid pro quo*, the commercial theory of the Atonement. It is quantitative rather than qualitative.

"Grotius \* \* \* viewed sin as a breach of God's public law, a rebellion against his government, which must be maintained and vindicated." "The interests of the public law and order" require a "penal example," "some compensation," lest sin should be lightly regarded." This

theory, though wrought out in opposition to Socinianism, is based on the conceptions of European law, and savors of the courthouse. Its chief value arises from the fact that it was a factor in modifying rigorous Calvinism.

The penal satisfaction theory, according to our author, finds representative expression in the language of the late Dr. Shedd: "Retributive justice is necessary in its operation, the claim of the law upon the transgressor for punishment is absolute and indefeasible. The eternal Judge may or may not exercise mercy, but he must exercise justice." *Infandum!* Christ was "vicariously punished;" punishment "must be strictly equivalent." Must Christ have remorse for sin? "Literally equivalent punishment."

Against these three theories Dr. Stevens enters objections in clear and incisive terms, and says finally: "The theories which are kindred to the thoughts of such men as Anselm, Melancthon, Turretin and even Grotius—the interpretation of the Work of Christ in mathematical, legal, and official analogies—are absolescent," p. 260.

This the critical and historical part of our author's work we regard as the most valuable part of the book. Whether the reader accepts or rejects the theories in question, he cannot convict the author of deficient information or of unfairness of representation.

In *Part III.* we have the *Constructive Development of Doctrine.* The first chapter deals with *The Christian Conception of God.* Here, we think, the author has magnified the Fatherhood of God at the expense of the rectoral attributes of God. The Christian conception of God dare not ignore the Old Testament conception of God, and dare not be constructed in opposition to the Old Testament conception of God, since Christianity has its roots in the religion of the Old Testament. Each conception taken by itself is different from the other. But the two must be so adjusted as to present the proper conception. *Paterfamilias*—and our author employs "the human analogy"—includes also a concept of *rectorfamilias*. Hence we object to the affirmation: "Fatherhood is synonymous with love," p. 265. Fatherhood includes the qualities of authority, honor, judgment, justice, law. Love is only one of the attributes of the eternal Father—the attribute turned most conspicuously towards the world in the New Testament (John 3 : 16), but it is not the only attribute of God revealed in the New Testament. He is still the righteous judge, and his judgments are true and righteous. Hence while with all our heart we accept the Lutheran concept: *Fons et origo salutis est amor Dei*, we nevertheless insist that God has published a law, and that that law cannot be violated with impunity, though this must not be interpreted to mean that Christ was *punished* for us.

Of course, as was to be expected, the author's own theory of the Atonement is determined by his "concept of God and of man." His theory is what is known as that of the moral influence of the Work of Christ—"the interpretation which construes it in terms of personal relationship and interest," p. 532. God is not reconciled to man. There is no "ground" of atonement God-ward. Man is reconciled to God. "God is

satisfied in the work of Christ because it is the nature of the divine love to give, to serve, and to suffer with and for its object," p. 426. "Substitution 'by strong sympathy' and satisfaction in self-sacrifice—that is a summary statement of my conclusion," p. 426.—all good, very good—so far as it goes. But it does not go far enough to satisfy *our* "Christian concept of God and of man," nor does it go deep enough to satisfy exegetically those passages in the New Testament which declare that Christ gave his life a ransom; that he is the propitiation for our sins; that by his stripes we are healed; made peace through the blood of the Cross; the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us. In our judgment the author of this book has not entered sufficiently into the meaning of the sufferings and death of Christ in their objective features and as they relate to the holiness of God and to the sinfulness of man. In a word, his Christian concept of God is too limited, onesided, sentimental; and his concept of man as a sinner is superficial.

But in offering these criticisms we do not mean to be understood as rejecting the emphasis laid on "the moral influence of Christ's work." We think that this feature was too much overlooked by the older theology. We mean to say that this moral influence theory does not exhaust the subject, does not go deep enough, is inadequate and one-sided. It does not have a proper and sufficient *ground* for the Atonement. It does not magnify the law and make it honorable. And here is just the weakness, in our judgment, of many of the modern theories of the relation of Christ's work to man's salvation. We are profoundly thankful to Professor Ritschl for his "judgments of value" (*Werturtheile*). Theology needed that word and also the thought it embodies. But the "value" of Christ to the sinner depends not a little upon what Christ is in himself, what he declared himself to be, what relation he inwardly sustains to the Father, who is also *Rector Mundi*. Hence we need to supplement the *Werturtheile* by proper and adequate conceptions of *Seinurtheile*.

And now, dissatisfied as we are with the commercial, the governmental, the penal theories of the Atonement, we find no satisfactory substitute in the moral influence theory. We have the conviction deeply ingrained in us that a fair and comprehensive exegesis of the New Testament passages that report the sufferings and death of Christ, and the apostolic interpretation and application of the sufferings and death of Christ, must bring out the doctrine of an instead-of-ness, of a substitutionary relation and conduct on the part of Christ, that will furnish a "ground," a reason, a cause of forgiveness, when Christ is appropriated by faith, that is, when the sinner by an act of inner penitent self-surrender and confidence of the heart, accepts Christ as his Saviour.

It is in the objective aspect of the Atonement that our author comes short, as it seems to us. And yet he has not set forth his theory in a dogmatizing manner, nor has he held it up as settling the controversy; nor does he claim to have delivered the final word on the subject. He is as modest as he is learned. He regards his work as only a contribution

to the exposition of a subject which can be set in the proper light only by the Christian thinking of generations.

The book deserves to be read by all theologians and clergymen, and also by intelligent laymen. It gives information and stimulates thought.

J. W. RICHARD.

*The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.* Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation. Delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in October and November, 1904. By William Sanday, D.D., LL.D. \$1.75 net.

The literature resulting from the study of the Fourth Gospel has been multiplying during recent past months, showing a renewed interest in the important subject.

Dr. James Drummond, successor of Dr. Martineau, and head of the principal educational institution of the Unitarians in England, has given pronouncement of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel in his recent celebrated work, *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*.

Dr. Sanday holds an eminent position for scholarship in the Anglican Church and his declarations carry weight because of his careful method of critical examination, and his candor and sincerity in estimating literary and patristic evidence. Dr. Sanday after careful and accurate handling of all evidences does not hesitate to pronounce the Fourth Gospel the work of John, the son of Zebedee.

His thorough scholarship and his acquaintance with patristic works have enabled him to show the weakness of the hypothesis that the gospel owes its origin to the uncertain personage, "John the Presbyter," or to a "Beloved Disciple" other than the son of Zebedee.

That the author was a Jew, and an eye-witness of the events which he describes, is as conclusively shown as internal evidence is capable of effecting literary demonstration. The force of literary evidence resides in those acute and refined indications of genuineness which the rough and ready expositor mostly fails to discern. The blow of blunt force that seems to kill is met by the keen cut of criticism which penetrates the vital elements of spiritual and ethical discernment. It is these delicate examinations, this looking around corners to view things in natural and psychological aspects, that gives real effect to literary and internal evidence.

Dr. Sanday holds to the Johannine authorship of the concluding chapter of the gospel, and of the prologue. The gospel was probably well formulated in mind before the prologue was composed; but whether precedent or antecedent to the body of the gospel, the prologue is a legitimate introduction. It is not likely that John ever read the works of Philo. The *logos* idea was in the air and John's use and development of the term has grown out of personal experience and probable discussion with men in Ephesus who were advocates of the popular religious philosophy.

Both patristic matter and internal evidence are fairly handled without any *tour de force*, the quality of the evidence as handled by Dr. Sanday against the necessity for bluster.

But one aspect of Dr. Sanday's work needs careful notice, and that is his somewhat frisky attitude toward the historicity of the gospel. Of what value is the gospel as an adequate description of the life and ministry of Jesus though certainly written by the son of Zebedee if the account is not accurate and reliable? Dr. Sanday says, "I do not honestly believe that everything happened exactly as it is, or seems to be, reported" (p. 157). Again, "I do not mean, by asserting this (eye-witness of events), to impose upon others the necessary consequence that everything happened (*i. e.* that we can realize it to ourselves as having happened) exactly as it is described." (p. 179).

Traditional authorship without transmission of content with reliable historicity is a weakening of the foundation of inspiration and revelation. If the objective fact be not secure, the free subjective handling of fact even by an apostle cannot present to us a real and true Jesus.

M. COOVER.

*The Bible, its Origin and Nature.* Seven Lectures delivered before Lake Forest College on the Foundation of the late William Bross. By Marcus Dods, D.D.

With the exception of Dr. Sanday probably no English Biblical scholar has given himself so absorbingly to the study of the Bible as Professor Marcus Dods. In his lectures on the Bross Foundation Dr. Dods sums up in seven chapters the opinion of present scholarly Bible students in regard to the Bible. In these chapters he treats of The Bible and Other Sacred Books, The Canon, Revelation, Inspiration, Infallibility, Trustworthiness, and The Miraculous Element.

The conclusion reached in respect of the Canon is the commonly accepted protestant opinion: "The two attributes which give canonicity are congruity with the main end of revelation and direct historical connection with the revelation of God in history.

On the subject of inspiration Dr. Dods is careful not to assume too much, and in consequence claims little or much according to the interpretation applied to his statement: "Inspiration enables its possessor to see and apprehend God and His will, and to impart to other men what he has himself seen and apprehended; but of any further power it confers it is precarious to make assertions." (p. 127).

In respect of infallibility he says, "It would seem that the members of our churches are yet far from understanding that the authentication of Christ cannot be touched by criticism; that He is His own best witness, and that this witness is independent of any doctrine or theory of the inspiration or infallibility of Scripture." (p. 157). In this candid statement is manifest the unstable attitude toward the historicity of Biblical events. To escape a subjective interpretation of Christ which is no sure



Christ historically, we must have an historic account of Him. Without a basic historic Christ whose Christ are we to accept? "He is His own best witness," says Dr. Dods, but that witness is from the lips of a recorder whose record is suffered to be reconstructed according to the taste of modern criticism.

Though Dr. Dods minimizes the effect of extreme criticism by saying, "We need as little fear the nibblings of criticism as we fear the minute erosions of our shores by the ocean," (p. 157) yet his position is one only of degree with that of such critics as Wernle, Juelicher, and Schmiedel. The erosion produces an immersion of slow process while the German criticism permits of sudden and complete continental submergence. The objective facts of Biblical history are strenuously assailed by the critical school, and with a sifting of material a subjective reconstruction of the events and sayings is deemed a necessity. Dr. Dods disclaims any desire to reconstruct the record, yet expresses doubtful repose in the historical accuracy of the Bible.

The assumed defects of New Testament history as a mode of revelation may not imperil seemingly any essential doctrine of religion, and yet the principle renders precarious the security of the whole. The subjective sifting of Biblical matter must affect the principle of reliability and trustworthiness, and the reconstructors necessarily assume a religious consciousness and discernment superior even to apostolic writers. Dr. Dods accords in general with the views of present scholarship in the unsettled state of debateable principles, the trend of which is toward the unfortunate last utterances of the late Dr. A. B. Bruce expressed in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Subjective treatment by reconstruction of the details of the life and ministry of Jesus must result in mere value judgments where the details of objective fact are waived. The historicity especially of the New Testament, and the ethics of religion, form now the battle ground on which the principles of religious interpretation must be fought out and settled.

M. COOVER.

EATON AND MAINS.

*Vision and Task.* By George Clarke Peck, D.D. Cloth, gilt top. 289 pages. Price, \$1.00

Dr. Peck's sermons are already well known through his three earlier books. The present volume contains fifteen sermons in the brief and terse style which characterizes the author. The texts are short, often a phrase legitimately separated from the rest of the sentence. The themes, correctly drawn from the several texts, command immediate attention. The sermons go straight to the mark and convey the truth to the problems and conditions of life to-day. There is good and suggestive reading here, and material for expansion without detriment to the sermon.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.



*Christianity and Socialism.* By Washington Gladden (7¼x5; pp. 244; price \$1.00 net.)

If it were desired to nominate the foremost man in the American pulpit today certainly one of the first names to be considered would be that of Dr. Washington Gladden. It is not his ministry to an influential congregation, but his convincing logic and common sense, his superiority to material good, his valuation of man as man, his long and honorable career and the confidence inspired by his fairness that give him his primacy. Of course we must add to this his writings which have made his name familiar in every intelligent community in the land. No man has done more than he in affixing its proper stigma and the condemnation of religion upon ill-gotten wealth. His application of the Sermon on the Mount to the solution of the most troublesome problems of modern society and his judicial temper in looking at all sides of a question are conspicuous in his latest utterance on Christianity and Socialism. His views are not commonplace, though they command assent by their fundamental simplicity and reasonableness. Whether acquired honestly or dishonestly wealth is not the foremost thing in the world. "Property is tributary to brotherhood, not brotherhood to property." Every man is bound to see not only that he wins a living for himself, but that in his business activity he performs an actual service to his fellow men and performs it well. The diffusion of the ideas of this book through society would make rarer the collisions of interest and make them easier of settlement when they do arise.

J. A. HIMES.

*The Last Message of Jesus Christ or The Apocalypse in a New Light.*  
By Rev. John Hamilton Timbrell. \$1.75 net.

The author feels assured that he has a message for the Church in his exposition of the Revelation of St. John. He regards the Apocalypse as rightly placed at the close of the Bible as the last New Testament production. "Delving within its treasure lodes in search of hidden wealth, his conviction of the value of the book has steadily appreciated." "What he has brought forth seems to him to possess sufficient indications of gold to justify this resort to the alembic of public criticism." (pp. 1-2). "Let us but emulate these heroic spirits to whom we owe so much, dig a little deeper, unmindful either of scholastic disdain or of fanatical vociferation, and the result may be an exhumed Apocalypse. The cry of outraged truth, writhing upon the rack of the destructive criticism, and the needs of a half enlightened church, moribund and helpless in the presence of the issues of the hour, unite to spur us forward with pick and shovel." (pp. 4-5).

This work, however, is not addressed to the scholarly. "The book is addressed to him 'that hath an ear.'" "When we lay mere scholarship aside, and our faces in the dust, strange flashes of light begin to come as

it were through the fringes of the veil, as the earnest of the divine splendors concealed behind its impenetrable foldings." (p. 12).

Before St. John "The glorified Christ stands in the forefront of the vision; the Eternal Father, veiled in mystic splendor, is throned above the lightnings and thunders; a mighty Angel clothed with the clouds of heaven, with the sunlit face of the Alpha and Omega, rises to view—completing a series of sublime epiphany that unquestionably touches the mighty deep of the Holy Trinity." (p. 7).

"With eyes flaming as the lightnings he takes the sweep of the ages, and with voice as the sound of many waters he articulates with lingual sword, through lips that have tasted death, his sublime message to the church universal." (p. 6). With this style of exposition with the author, "We stand under the vault of the midnight. We cannot touch one of its stars nor fathom the mystery that lies back of them; yet how they thrill and overwhelm us with their glory! So let us devoutly stand in the presence of the flamings of the mighty Apocalypse." (p. 10).

With bewilderment the reviewer stands, and yet takes one more glimpse at the prolegomena of the volume, at the *Comprehensive Diagram of the Plan of the Apocalypse: The Dramatis Personae*," (1) The Christophany; (2) The Theophany; (3) The Pneumatophany; (4) The Basilophany; (5) The Satanophany; (6) The Theriophany; (7) The Pseudo-Prophetophany. Still "we stand under the vault of the midnight." We will not venture "to touch one of its stars nor fathom the mystery that lies back of them." The atmosphere of fog seems to gather about us, and with forbodings of a dark night, and but dim hopes of a clear morning, we hesitate to proceed with the author any farther.

M. COOVER.

*Soul-Winning.* By Rev. Phidelia P. Carroll, Ph.D. Cloth, 110 pages. Price, 50 cents net.

The introduction by Bishop Charles H. Fowler, LL.D., would of itself commend this book. The author styles himself an ardent believer in genuine revivals of religion. But his experience in the ministry has convinced him of the necessity of more personal work among the unchurched. He presents here his methods, which commend themselves by their results. Concrete examples are used to illustrate his methods. Pastors who want help on the problem of soul-saving without special revival meetings, will derive much benefit from Dr. Carroll's experience.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

*The Divine Opportunity.* Sermons preached by F. B. Stockdale. Cloth bound. 136 pages. 50 cents net.

That familiar texts have not been exhausted of all their teaching is shown by these nine sermons. The author is a careful thinker and delivers his message clearly. The sermon on "The First Thing God Did" is especially edifying.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Katechismuspredigten über das erste und zweite Hauptstück, etc.* (pp. 275.) By Rev. C. C. Schmidt, St. Louis, Mo.

A volume of short sermons covering the first and second parts of Luther's Catechism. They were delivered by the author to his congregation in St. Louis, on Sunday afternoons, and are published by request. They were prepared by special reference to the requirements of the times, and the author deviates somewhat in the treatment of his themes from the beaten paths of German pulpit dialectics in order better to meet the necessities of the present day. There is, however, no departure from the form and substance of sound doctrine, and no shifting of the old land-marks in Theology to please a perverted and depraved taste, but an emphasizing of the doctrines of grace as over against a vain and misleading legalism.

Our Missouri brethren are certainly displaying a highly commendable zeal in the dissemination of a literature effective in the upbuilding of the Church and the doctrinating of her youth, and along this line the volume before us is worthy of special commendation.

R. H. CLARE.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY, PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK.

*The Prophets and Promise.* Rev. Willis Judson Beecher, Professor of Hebrew in Auburn Theological Seminary. Pp. 440. 8 vo. \$2.00 net.

The title page states that this work is for substance the Lectures for 1902-3 on the Stone Foundation in the Princeton Theological Seminary. The author affirms that "the presentation is essentially a restatement of the Christian tradition that was supreme fifty years ago, but a restatement with differences so numerous and important that it will probably be regarded by men who do not think things through as an attack on that tradition. I have tried to make my search a search for the truth without undue solicitude as to whether its results are orthodox; but it seems to me that my conclusions are simply the old orthodoxy to some extent transposed into the forms of modern thought, and with some new elements introduced, by widening the field of induction. We are further informed that he begins the examination of the Old Testament from a neutral standpoint as far as concerns the Higher Criticism, but one does not need to read far into the book before he will discover that a spirit of profound respect and veneration for the Christian tradition pervades the entire work, that the faith of the Christian Church is something sacred and must not be set aside except for sufficient reasons, that while there is a manifest willingness to accept well substantiated conclusions of scientific investigators, there is an equal readiness to reject mere guesses and unsupported deductions, and that while patient study and research are in evidence on every page the ultimate aim is not the defending of a theory or hypothesis but the setting forth of the truth as contained in the Word of God.

In the first part of the volume there are some fresh and striking points

under the discussion of the prophets, their appearance, their literary attainments, their function as reformers, statesmen, evangelistic preachers, and above all their mission as God's ambassador with a divine message. These descriptions give us a new conception of those grand heroes who were raised up to be Israel's guides and teachers during the dark centuries of its national life. In connection with the foregoing the distinctive meanings of the Hebrew words *raah* and *hharah* are very evenly pointed out.

On page 178 our author lays down this proposition: God gave a promise to Abraham and through him to mankind; a promise eternally fulfilled and fulfilling in the history of Israel; and chiefly fulfilled in Jesus Christ, he being that which is principal in the history of Israel. This is the central thought around which the discussion revolves, the theme of the entire volume, and to the elucidation of this theme the author brings the ripest scholarship, the fruitage of years of labor and research. He shows how the Promise runs like a scarlet thread through the whole Bible from Genesis to Revelation, how it was believed in by the patriarchs and proclaimed by the prophets of old, and how it is taken up by the Apostles in the New Testament and unfolded and preached to the waiting nations of the earth. And this is done in such a thorough and masterly way that when one lays down the book at the end of the last chapter the feeling is that nothing more remains to be said on the subject. We are sure that this work will be a standard authority in theological literature.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON: NEW YORK, N. Y.

*Complete Index to the Expositor's Bible:* Topical and Textual. By S. G. Ayres, B.D., Librarian of Drew Theological Seminary. Also, General Preface to The Expositor's Bible by the Editor, W. Robertson Nicoll, A.M., LL.D., together with Introductions to the Old and New Testament sections by W. H. Bennett, D.D., Professor of O. T. Exegesis at New College, London, and Walter F. Adeney, M.A., Professor of N. T. Exegesis at Lancashire College, Manchester. Pp. 312.

It is not surprising that a librarian should see the need of an index to a large work and appreciate its full value. But it is not often that a librarian will undertake to meet this need. Librarian Ayres, therefore, may well be assured of the appreciation of the work he has done here with the forty-eight or fifty volumes that make up the Expositor's Bible. Every owner of this work will rise up and call him blessed.

The goods of this valuable storehouse are here classified and listed, and time is saved in searching for what you want. The investigator can turn at once to the volume and page to find out what each author says on the subject he has in hand. To the busy preacher this is of inestimable value and greatly enhances the worth of the whole work.

Whatever complaint a rigid conservatism may make against the Expositor's Bible, on account of the color it has received from the school of

the Higher Criticism, it will be found far more refreshing and stimulating, and not less scholarly, than most of our commentaries constructed on the exegetical plan. And although most of the contributors may be shy of the traditional interpretation of many parts of the Scriptures, their reverence and love for sacred word will appear manifest everywhere. They represent different Evangelical Churches and different schools of Biblical criticism. There will be found Anglicans like the Bishop of Derry, Presbyterians like Professor G. A. Smith, and Free Churchmen like Doctor MacLaren.

But it is not our purpose to comment on the work. We gave our views of the separate volumes as they appeared some years ago. We merely want to say that there are treasures here to show the serviceable work done in this index, which will serve, in a large measure, as a key to unlock them.

But the title page, as we have given it, will show that there is more in this volume than this index. Besides the excellent preface of the editor, we have the introductions to the Old and New Testament sections by Professors Bennett and Adeney respectively. These introductions are frank statements or reviews of what has appeared in recent years in literature and archaeological discovery, bearing on questions in dispute in Biblical criticism, not a little of which is confirmatory of the old time "traditional interpretation."

P. M. BIKLE.

GERMAN LITERARY BOARD, BURLINGTON, IOWA.

*Revelation Twenty.* A concise evangelical Treatise and Exposition. By Simon M. Lutz, A. M., B. D., Chaplain U. S. Army, and Rev. Paul G. Krutzky, A. M. Pp. 24. Price 10c. a copy or \$1.00 per dozen.

This little pamphlet contains Introductory Remarks. An Exposition of the twentieth chapter of Revelation and brief discussions of Death, Resurrection, Hades and Millenium. The interpretation is straightforward, evangelical and scriptural with no attempt to read forced meanings into the several symbolical expressions, and the treatment of the topics at the end of the book is temperate, and in accord with the views held by the Christian Church.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Amerikanischer Kalender für Deutsche Lutheraner.*

Besides the matter usually found in almanacs, this contains a biographical sketch of Pastor John Paul Beyer, statistics of the various General Bodies of the Lutheran Church in this country, together with the usual clerical register.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

## ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON, MASS.

The prospectus of the *Atlantic Monthly* for 1906 is one of the most promising that has ever been sent out by this leader of American literary magazines. During the year Dr. William Osler will contribute an article on "The Ideal Physician;" and Charles Cuthbert Hall, President of Union Theological Seminary, one on "The Ideal Minister." "The Ideal Lawyer," and "The Ideal Journalist," will be the subjects of later papers. "Is the Theatre Worth While?" will be answered by James L. Metcalfe, dramatic critic of *Life*. Richard Mansfield will write of "The Art of Acting versus the Art of Talking." Great questions as, "Rich Men and the Body Politic." Industrials as Investments; "Railroad Securities as Investments;" and "Causes of Commercial Panics," will be discussed by men whose judgment is trusted. Writers of international reputation will furnish brilliant short stories, there will be interpretative criticism of the work of living writers by eminent critics. John Burroughs will write of "Camping with the President." Many additional features of similar attraction will be found in the magazine during the coming year, making it altogether a periodical that the person ambitious for culture cannot afford to do without.

## LUTHERANS IN ALL LANDS CO.

*Luther's Church Postil.* Gospels, Thirteenth to Twenty-sixth Sunday after Trinity. Translated by Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. Pp. 395 \$2.25.

This is the second volume of Luther's incomparable Church Postil, translated by Dr. Lenker and his co-laborers. These sermons are wholesome reading for pastor and people. Marked by Luther's insight into Scripture and expressed in simple language they appeal to us after the lapse of centuries. The reader is impressed with Luther's glorification of grace and faith over against work-righteousness. The sermons have the true gospel ring. Dr. Lenker deserves the patronage of the Church in his effort to put Luther's writings within the reach of the English speaking public.

J. A. SINGMASTER.